NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCLXXX

JULY, 1912

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND SOCIAL-ISM

BY THE EDITOR

Eugene Victor Debs, born in Terre Haute, Indiana, in 1855, was first nominated for President in 1900 by the Social Democratic party, and received 94,173 votes. He had obtained a rudimentary education in the common schools, had worked as a locomotive fireman and as a salesman for a wholesale grocery house, had served as city clerk and as a member of the State Legislature, and, at the time of his nomination, was President of the American Railway Union. While acting in the last-mentioned capacity he had won a strike on the Great Northern railroad, had been tried for conspiracy and acquitted, and had served six months in prison for contempt of court.

In 1904 Mr. Debs was nominated for President by the Socialist party, as it is now constituted, and polled 433,532 votes; in 1908 he was renominated, and achieved a like result under less favorable circumstances. He has now been proposed a third time with substantial unanimity and anticipates a marked increase in voting strength at the polls in November. The results of by-elections during the past two years, greatly intensified by the effects of the fervid appeals of others to the spirits of class and discontent, clearly indicate that the hope is not without foundation.

Here is the record of the Socialist vote in the United States since it became appreciable in size:

Copyright, 1912, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Socialist	Total vote	Percentage of whole
1892	21,164	12,059,351	One-sixth of 1%
1896	36,274	13,923,102	One-quarter of 1%
1900	127,553	13,961,566	Nearly 1%
1904	433,532	13,528,979	Over 3%
1908	434,618	14,888,442	Nearly 3%
1910	607,674	11,000,000 (est.)	About 5½%
1911	1,100,000 (est.)	11,000,000 (est.)	Fully 10%

The Socialist vote in 1904 was swelled by the ballots of probably 200,000 radicals who would not accept either of the two presumably conservative candidates for President. The vote in 1908 was an accurate measure of the Socialist strength. The estimates for 1910 and 1911 are based upon tabulations made by expert accountants. It will be seen, therefore, that the growth has increased steadily in both numbers and ratio. The same tendency unchecked would produce a Socialist vote in 1912 of 2,000,000 out of an estimated total of 15,600,000—thirteen per cent.—and in 1916 of fully 5,000,000, or nearly one-third of the whole number —the present proportion in Germany.

The recent election result in Milwaukee, in which all political parties united in a successful effort to depose a Socialist administration, has been cited generally as an indication that Socialism is on the wane. That it was quite the reverse is shown by the following table covering the elections of the past fourteen years:

Year	Socialist	Gain Per cent.	Non-Socialist	Gain Per cent.
1898	2,444	561.4	44,211	4.2
1900	2,473	1.1	47,778	8.1
1902	8,373	238.6	49,887	4.4
1904	15,333	83.3	41,118	*17.4
1906	16,784	9.4	44,118	7.5
1908	20,887	24.4	41,517	*6.0
1910	27,608	32.2	31,876	*23.3
1912	30,272	9.4	43,176	35.3

* Loss.

The issue was Americanism sharply defined. The allied citizens marched under the Stars and Stripes. The Socialists openly flaunted the red banner. And yet the Socialist vote increased nearly three thousand, while the total opposition vote was actually less than that polled in 1898. Had the Republicans and the Democrats failed to act as a complete unit the Socialists would have won an easy victory.

Far more striking and significant than the figures of the record, however, are the responses favorable to Socialistic doctrines which have recently been elicited by skilful appeal throughout the length and breadth of the land. "Social justice," as opposed to constitutional guarantees of in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dividual liberty and property protection, is not a new motto of those who would destroy the existing order. It has been blazoned for years upon the cloak under which are grouped Direct Government by the People, Popular Supremacy over the Judiciary, Human Rights *versus* Constitutional Liberty, Collective Ownership and Management of Land and Public Utilities, Independence of Restrictive Law, Immediate Application of (presumed) Remedial Proposals and all other constituents of Pure Democracy, as differentiated from the representative government first definitely established on American soil. The phrase itself, so glittering and pleasing, is admirably adapted to specious use by those who would play upon the strings of human envy and avarice, no less than those of human heedlessness and ignorance, and none can deny that it has been so employed with marked effectiveness.

But guile is ever evasive, never explicit. "Social justice" lives in the mind and upon the lips of the crafty propagandist only as a generality. It remains for the declared Socialist—the sincere believer, not the base pretender—to draw back the cloak and reveal the means by which he proposes to achieve his millennial end. It clearly behooves us, then, to examine and study the latest declaration of doctrines made by the Socialist party in the hope of winning a more general support from the American people.

Assuming as a major premise that "the overwhelming majority of the people of America are being forced under a yoke of bondage by soulless industrial despotism," the Socialist party proposes to remedy the condition thus depicted by affirmative acts designed to accomplish the following results:

"Abolition of the Senate and the veto power of the President.

"Adoption of Initiative, Referendum, and Recall, nationally as well as locally."

In other words, vest all power of legislation in the mass of the people, retaining only a semblance of representative government in the House of Representatives, whose members would be subject to recall. Under this system, as now practised in Oregon, a majority of the votes cast throughout the country would enact any proposed law.

"Abolition of the power usurped by the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of the legislation enacted by Congress."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This would enable the majority of voters to pass upon the constitutionality of the laws which they themselves had enacted. The effect would be identical with that of the proposed plan to permit the people to recall decisions, but the operation would be less cumbersome.

"Abolition of the Federal district courts and the United States Circuit Court of Appeals. The election of all judges for short terms."

Thus virtually establish popular government on the bench as well as in legislative halls.

"Abolish the profit system in government work and substitute direct hire of labor or awarding of contracts to co-operative groups of workers.

"Establish minimum wage scales.

"Establish old-age pensions and enforce upon the State and all employers a system of insurance against industrial diseases, accidents, and deaths without cost to the workers.

"The immediate government relief of the unemployed by the extension of all useful public works. All persons employed on such works to be engaged directly by the government under a work-day of not more than eight hours, and not less than the prevailing union wages. The government also to establish employment bureaus; to lend money to States and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works, and to take such other measures within its power as will lessen the wide-spread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class."

A comprehensive programme involving enormous expenditures of moneys whose sources are not indicated.

"Collective ownership and democratic management of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, and all other social means of transportation and of all large-scale industries."

Government ownership is understandable, but "collective ownership," even as defined by Jaures, has yet to be made clear to American minds. "Democratic management" of great organizations is wholly enigmatical.

"Immediate acquirement by the municipalities, the States, or the Federal Government of all grain-elevators, stock-yards, storage warehouses, and all other distributing agencies."

The intent is declared to be to reduce the cost of living, presumably by curtailing operating expense or by enhancing efficiency.

"Extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil-wells, forests, and water-powers."

Whether by new discovery, by purchase, or by confiscation is not revealed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Collective ownership of land wherever practicable, and in cases where such ownership is impracticable, the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all land held for speculation."

Obviously the question of "practicability" is here so transcendent as to render speculation as to method futile.

"Collective ownership and democratic management of the banking and currency system."

Again arises the Socialists' distinction between government and collective ownership. As stated, the proposition might easily be deprived of the word "system," which seems to be curiously lacking in co-relationship with either democratic or collective direction of fiscal business.

Such are the chief "measures of relief" which are offered by the Socialist party, not as an end, but frankly as only "a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of socialized industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance."

Assuming for the sake of argument, despite the candor of the declaration quoted, that actual confiscation is not in prospect, that "evolution, not revolution" is the real intent, and that the Socialist lode-star is indeed simple equity among humans, what say reason and practical sense, not as to the justice or injustice of the proposals and not at all as to the motives of their sponsors and advocates, but simply as to the possibility of fulfilment of the hopes expressed?

Take first the financial and commercial phases. Dismiss impecunious Collectivity as a purchasing power and regard Government, the agent of the whole people, as buyer and recompenser. Clearly the hundreds of billions of dollars required for the acquirement of all of the railways, telegraphs, telephones, manufacturing plants, grain-elevators, stock-yards, warehouses, mines, water-powers, agricultural lands, and virgin forests could not be obtained by taxation upon incomes and imports, since the sum total of both would be but as a drop in the bucket. How, then? By the issuance of government obligations, not for sale in the limited markets of the world, but directly to the present holders of the properties. That is the ready answer, coupled with the no less sprightly assurance that, under "democratic management," the earnings derived from operation would more than suffice to meet interest requirements. For reasons ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parent, the one business enterprise in which the government is engaged, that of transporting the mails at a loss, despite immunity from rental payments upon an immensely costly plant, is not cited in evidence. Theory is the foundation and assumption the keystone of the arch. Fortunately, illustrations based upon fact are not wanting. Bankrupt New Zealand affords, perhaps, the one most striking, and France offers many. A concrete example from England, however, will serve the present purpose.

Responding to the popular demand for nationalization of public utilities, the British Government recently acquired the property of the National Telephone Company and annexed the business to that of the Post-office Department. Soon thereafter, replying to employees who sought reduction of hours and increase of wages, the Postmaster-General made the following statement:

"That the Post-office, after all, is not such a bad employer of labor is, I think, evident from the improvement in the condition of the Telephone Company's employees who have been transferred to the Post-office. It is rarely that we have the opportunity of making an exact comparison between the conditions in State employment and the conditions in similar employment outside. We have the opportunity in this case. The employees of the National Telephone Company numbered 19,000. On transfer to the Post-office they enjoy the conditions of the Post-office servants of the same grade doing the same work. The consequence has been that in wages alone that staff are now receiving £175,000 a year more than they would have received if they had remained with the Company, and owing to the shortening of the hours of work and the increase of holidays granted I have had to employ a larger staff, involving an increase in the wages bill of £32,000 a year. The pension rights granted to the Telephone Company's employees involve an increase to the amount of £201,000 a year when the pensions mature. So that altogether these 19,000 telephone employees benefit in money or in money's worth to the extent of £408,000 a year, or a sum of over £20 per person, or 8*s*. per week."

The net result of the transaction is necessarily a heavy loss to the Government, involving an added burden to the taxpayers from the very beginning. First, the license payments formerly made by the company were forfeited; secondly, the plant was bought at a price, probably high, yet to be fixed by appraisers; thirdly, the wages bill, although raised immediately more than £400,000 per annum, is still unsatisfactory to the employees. Meanwhile the newspapers teem with complaints of the service, whose former inefficiency seems incredibly to have been intensified, and fresh demands upon the Treasury for funds required for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extensions and improvements have already added £3,000,000 to the estimates for the ensuing year.

The proposal contained in the platform of our own Socialist party differs in no respect from the performance in England. The property is to be acquired in the same manner, hours of labor are to be reduced, wages are to be increased, pensions are to be granted, and insurance is to be enforced upon the State "without cost to the workers." Assuming like results in practice, the purchase price of the properties owned by the American Telephone and Telegraph and allied companies would be about $1,250,000,000, a sum equivalent to nearly fifty per cent. of the present National debt. The interest charge at four per cent. would be $50,000,000. This would be discharged, according to the Socialist theory, from net earnings. But here, as in England, the first act of the State would be to divert this revenue to the pockets of the employees to the extent of not less, and probably much more, than $100 per person—in sum total about $20,000,000 per annum. Moreover, if the sums required for extensions and improvements should correspond to the ratio of business done, the State would be required to furnish immediately ten times as much as the increase asked by the British Postmaster-General, or fully $150,000,000, upon which, of course, interest would have to be paid in one form or another. Assuming equally efficient management and equal industry upon the part of employees—contrary to all known experience—the net result would be the transformation of a great, prosperous, public-service corporation, whose dividends have averaged nearly eight per cent. for half a century, into a Government concern bearing a certain deficit larger than the cost of all of the battle-ships now annually constructed.

That like consequences would attend State ownership and "democratic management" of railways and manufacturing industries no observant or even sane man can doubt for a moment. Attempt to compute the sums involved in an undertaking so colossal would be futile. An impression, however, may be derived from the British experience noted above. Employees of the Federal Government now number 515,000, and pensioners 892,000. The Socialist programme would add to the Government service 1,700,000 employees for steam railways, 250,000 for street railways, 225,000 for telegraphs and telephones, 1,000,000 for industries organized

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" on a National scale," 500,000 for mines, forests, etc., and not less than 6,000,000 for cultivation of agricultural lands —a grand total of approximately 10,000,000 persons. The immediate cost of transference from private employment to public employment has been shown by the British experiment to average $100 per person. The complete fulfilment of the Socialist proposal, therefore, would involve at the outset an increase in wages and benefits amounting to *one thousand millions of dollars a year, for which there would be no return whatever.*

Where this billion per annum might be expected to come from need not be considered. The whole scheme, of course, is chimerical, absurd, impossible. And yet the Socialist ranks are swelling daily, not merely from immigrations, but from universities, from pulpits, from workshops, and from farms. How could it be otherwise when the Presidential nominee of one great political party but recently advocated government ownership of railways and has since evidenced no change of view; when a former President representing a large proportion of the party in power seeks popular favor by proposing mass rule as a substitute for representative government; and when a Postmaster-General officially recommends absorption of the telegraphs by the National Government?

Have the American people ceased to think or to care? Cannot they perceive that " Social Justice," as now exploited, is Social*ism* pure and simple? Or, so seeing, are they willing to sit idly by while the great ship Republic drifts steadily and unheeded toward the rocks of unbridled confiscation and immeasurable confusion?

Because we cannot answer we ask these vital questions.

THE EDITOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SYNDICALISM

BY LOUIS LEVINE

THE world has been startled of late by the appearance of a new actor in the drama of social life. Coming at a juncture when he was least expected, the new *dramatis persona* at once upset the situation which he found and began accelerating the movement of events and passions. He came but yesterday, but his determined planning and intense action have already made it clear that he has a momentous part to play and that the development of the social drama will in no small measure depend upon what he wills and does.

This new *dramatis persona* is the Syndicalist. But a short while ago he may have been considered a peculiar product of that peculiar country, France, which has furnished the world for nearly a century with "freakish" social ideas and "fantastic" social schemes. But now no one can any longer hold that view. The Syndicalist has invaded "common-sense" England and has raised his voice in the "land of the free." He has become an international figure, and his ideas are of significance to the entire world.

Taken by surprise, however, the world has not had an opportunity as yet properly to measure the new-comer, to find out what he wants. In fact, the task is not so easy. It would seem that the Syndicalist really had nothing to wish that had not already been supplied. It would seem that in a world where Trade-Unionist, Social Reformer, Socialist, and Anarchist vied with one another in curing all the social evils of the times, no new brand of "ism" was possible and no room left for an "ist" of a new kind. The fact, however, cannot be argued away: the new "ist" is here and proclaims he has a new message for the world. There must be, then, something in Syndicalism which differentiates it from any other known "ism," and the question naturally arises, What is it?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a general way the answer may be given at the very outset. Syndicalism is an attempt to combine Socialism and Trade-Unionism in a higher synthesis in which the labor unions should become the basis of Socialism, and Socialism the ideal expression of the unions. Such a synthesis necessarily presupposes certain modifications in the structure and ideas of both Socialism and Trade-Unionism, and, like every other synthesis, contains something that was not present in its constituent elements.

The Syndicalist synthesis cannot be regarded as an entirely sudden phenomenon in the world of social thought and practice. On the contrary, it can be traced back to the "International Association of Working-men" founded in 1864, and even further back to the first half of the nineteenth century when both Socialism and Trade-Unionism were making their first awkward steps. It is not at all strange that this should be so. Syndicalism is the child of peculiar conditions and of a peculiar psychology closely bound up with Socialism and Trade-Unionism. It is but natural, therefore, that it should be found in some rudimentary form in the early stages of the social movement of the nineteenth century and that the Syndicalism of to-day should be the mature fruit of seeds sown long ago.

It will be easier to understand the nature of the fruit by first analyzing the seed and by examining the environment in which it struck root and grew. The seed was the idea of Socialism. Ever since the problem of labor in its modern phase arose, in the early part of the nineteenth century, one solution offered was to solve the labor problem by dissolving the wages system. As a rule, this solution came from the so-called better, and certainly better educated, classes of society who were deeply moved by the sufferings of the working-class. Accustomed to abstract and general reasoning, these representatives of the middle classes and of the aristocracy sought for the general causes of the social evils and found them in the institution of private property and in competition. They therefore called upon society to do away with private property and to reorganize industry on the basis of collective solidarity and collective responsibility. As a recompense for following their advice, they held out to the world the promise of a new social era in which Equality, Liberty, and Fraternity would truly reign supreme.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Born amidst the upper classes, the idea of Socialism soon swept a portion of the working-class. A number of intelligent, active, and ambitious working-men were charmed and fascinated by the grand visions of Socialism and became ardently devoted to the cause of emancipating their fellow-working-men from the "thraldom" of the wages-system. The ideal of industrial freedom, social equality, and intellectual opportunities thrilled their souls with the deepest enthusiasm, and they felt themselves to be the inspired leaders in a great historic movement which, in their opinion, was to liberate their class and to rejuvenate the world.

The militant Socialist working-man soon found out, however, that his task was not easy and that his situation was full of inner contradictions. In the Socialist organizations of all types—secret, revolutionary, educational, and so forth—which he frequented he was at all times thrown together with more or less numerous descendants of the middle class who were attracted to Socialism for various reasons and who claimed the part of intellectual leaders in the Socialist movement. These "intellectuals," as they were dubbed by the working-men, surely possessed superior lights and were better fit by training and experience for the rôle of leaders. The Socialist working-man was loath, however, to acknowledge this. Awakened to a sense of the historical importance of his class, enthused by the idea of social equality, thrilled by the sentiment of his own intellectual growth, he resented any suggestion of inequality within the Socialist ranks themselves, and watched with suspicion and ill feeling the tendency of the "intellectuals" toward leadership and predominance. He could not at all times effectively counteract it. But he was always ready to turn upon the middle-class "intellectuals," to whose intuition and reasoning he owed the idea of Socialism, and to start a movement in which his own predominance would not be threatened. This tendency, on the part of the militant Socialist working-man, runs like a thread through the whole history of modern Socialism.

On the other hand, turning to his own class, the militant Socialist working-man soon convinced himself that he could not get at once the response he so hopefully expected. The large mass of the working-class was actuated by simpler and more elementary motives. It wanted some improvement right now and here, it cared more for things than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for principles, it had a keener feeling for the pangs of the stomach than for the pains of the heart or brain. The Socialist working-man regretted and deplored this state of affairs, but he could not ignore it. After all, he was a working-man himself, who knew by bitter experience what it meant to be in want. He had to adapt himself, therefore, to the conditions and psychology of his class and to take an interest in their immediate demands if he wanted them to take an interest in his far-away ideal. As a rule, the mass of the workers hit independently upon the means of improving their immediate condition—means which hinged upon the idea of combination and organization, and which resulted in the rise and development of Trade-Unionism. The militant Socialist working-man was thus driven to do his share in the work of the Trade-Unions, for there was no hope for him outside the ranks of his own class.

But entering the Trade-Union, the Socialist working-man never lost sight of his ideal. Nor did he lose his impatience with existing conditions or his feverish hope to bring about his ideal as soon as possible. He was a Social Faust within whose breast two souls resided—one clinging to the sufferings and demands of his class in the present, the other sweeping "the dust of the present above into the high spaces" of Socialism in the future. But, like Faust, he was not content to have his breast rent in twain. On the contrary, he was intent upon realizing, as soon as possible, a harmonious union of the conflicting feelings, ideas, and aspirations which his peculiar economic, political, and intellectual existence called into being.

The history of the Socialist movement reveals the gropings of the militant Socialist working-man for the unity just spoken of, and this is why rudimentary Syndicalist ideas may be found all along in the social movement of the nineteenth century. But before Syndicalism could assume its present developed form, it was necessary that the conditions described above should become more pronounced and accentuated. This was brought about in the latter part of the past century by a complicated chain of economic, political, and other causes.

In the nineties of the past century the Socialists had their first big electoral successes in France, Germany, and other countries. They not only polled a large number of votes, but succeeded in electing many of their members to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national and municipal legislative bodies. The result was a change in the composition and character of the Socialist parties. The latter were everywhere invaded by large and new sections of the middle class, particularly by representatives of the liberal professions such as doctors, lawyers, teachers, and so forth, who swamped the Socialist workingmen in all positions of authority and responsibility in the Socialist party, Socialist press, and Socialist parliamentary groups. The invading "intellectuals" carried with them their group feelings, their habits of mind, and their methods of procedure. They introduced into the Socialist movement the ideas of slow evolutionary changes, of a gradual "growing-in" into Socialism, of peaceful and diplomatic negotiations with "capitalist" political parties. They extolled the importance and influence of legislative bodies in which they could display their general knowledge, oratorical powers, and resplendent qualities. In a word, they imparted to Socialism that exclusively political and legislative character—smooth and moderate—which has in recent years both surprised and soothed the world.

At the same time the political Socialists were not slow to show their intention of subordinating the economic organizations of the working-class to the political party. To the political Socialist the Trade-Union could not but appear as a secondary organization which wrangles with employers over minor matters and which is insignificant in comparison with the great political organization. The political Socialist could value the Trade-Union mainly as a field for recruiting new Socialist converts and could expect nothing more from an organization which, in his opinion, was to disappear after the triumph of Socialism and which could play but a subordinate part in the movement toward Socialist victory to be brought about by capturing the political machinery of the State.

The change in the character of Socialism—its marked evolution in the direction of an exclusively political, peaceful, and legal movement—blazed into fire the embers of discontent which had slumbered in the breast of the militant Socialist working-man. The latter was alarmed by the success of political Socialism, which, in his opinion, was dangerous to the real success of the Social Revolution. The militant working-man suspected the environment of Parliament, its methods and political trickery, and felt in his heart a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growing antagonism to a form of action which led the Socialists into the stifling embrace of "capitalist" parliamentary institutions. The militant Socialist working-man therefore began to look about for another form of social movement which would embody his revolutionary spirit, preserve his hope of a speedy emancipation, and secure for him equality within the organization. He had groped for such a movement for years and years. He had organized secret revolutionary societies, he had tried Socialist co-operatives, he had attempted open revolt. But his previous attempts had been unsuccessful, and, furthermore, former methods were no longer applicable under the new conditions of the latter part of the nineteenth century. The militant working-man saw that the development of democracy and the expansion of industry had made necessary a form of organization which would be broad enough to include large masses and flexible enough to be capable of both political and economic action. Examining more closely the nature of the Trade-Union in which he had always played some part, the militant Socialist working-man was struck by the idea that it offered the form of organization he was so eagerly looking for and that it was capable of carrying on the social movement in which he placed his hopes. He therefore now changed his former attitude to the Trade-Union; instead of merely suffering it, he now began actively to support it and to shape it in accordance with his views and aspirations.

By a process of careful reasoning and under the influence of experience the militant Socialist working-man gradually developed the whole theory of Syndicalism in which the Syndicat — or labor union — is the basis, end, and means. The Syndicat—acording to this theory—is the organization which first brings the working-men together, binds them by ties of common interest, develops in them the sentiment of solidarity, and consolidates them into a coherent self-conscious class. Organized in the Syndicats, the working-men are in a position to enter into a direct struggle with employers and the State for better conditions of life and work. Direct action—which the Syndicalists so much insist upon—consists in exerting energetic pressure and coercion on the employers and the State in such a manner as to rally all the workers around one banner in direct opposition to existing institutions. Nation-wide strikes,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vehement agitation, public demonstrations, and like procedures, which arouse passions and shake up the mass of the working-men, are in the view of the Syndicalists the only methods which can make the working-men clearly perceive the evils and contradictions of present-day society and which lead to material successes. Such methods alone drive home to the working-men the truth that the emancipation of the workers must and can be the work of the workers themselves, and free the latter from the illusion that anybody else—even their representatives in Parliament—can do the job for them. By constantly bringing working-men into open and sharp conflict with employers, Direct Action, in all its manifestations, necessarily undermines the foundations of existing society and fortifies the position of the working-class. Every successful strike, every victory of labor—when gained by energetic pressure and Direct Action—is regarded by the Syndicalists as a blow directed against capitalism and as a strategic point occupied by the workers on their way toward final emancipation. Reforms, therefore, gained and upheld by Direct Action do not strengthen existing society, but, on the contrary, dilapidate it and pave the way for a complete and violent social transformation.

The latter, in the opinion of the Syndicalists, is inevitable. The direct struggles of the Syndicats—argue they—increasing in scope and importance, must finally lead to a decisive collision in which the two antagonistic classes—the working-class and the employers—will be brought face to face. How that decisive struggle will be begun cannot be foretold. But it most probably will have its origin in a strike which, spreading from industry to industry and from locality to locality, will involve the whole country and affect the entire nation. This will be the General Strike, in which the issue will not be an increase of wages or any other minor matter, but the paramount social issue: who shall henceforth control industry and direct the economic activities of the nation?

The Syndicalists will not wait for Parliament to decide that question, but will take matters into their own hands. When the " final hour of emancipation " strikes, the militant working-men organized in the Syndicats will step in and assume control of all means of production, transportation, and exchange. They will proclaim the common ownership of all means of production, and will start production under the direction of the Syndicats. Every Syndicat will have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the use of the means of production necessary for carrying on its work. All Syndicats of a locality will be organized in local federations which will have charge of all local industrial matters. These local Federations of Labor will collect all statistics pertaining to local production and consumption, will provide the raw material, and will act as intermediaries between a locality and the rest of the country. All Syndicats of the country in any one industry will be organized in a National Industrial Federation having charge of the special interests of the industry, while local federations and industrial federations will be organized in one great National Federation of Labor which will take care of matters national in scope and importance.

This ideal, according to the Syndicalists, is not a scheme or a Utopia whose realization depends upon the good-will or wisdom of any individual or individuals. It is a social system gradually evolved by the Syndicalist movement and gradually prepared by the social struggles of to-day. The framework of the ideal society is being built every day by the growth of organization among the working-men, by the ever-spreading network of Syndicats, local, industrial, and national federations. And the intellectual and moral qualities necessary for controlling society are gradually acquired by the working-men in their organizations, in their struggle, and in their every-day experiences.

Here, in this theory, the militant working-man finally achieved the synthesis he was groping for. The Syndicat —or labor union—kept out the middle class "intellectual," barred the politician, and made compromise impossible. On the other hand, it secured the leadership of the revolutionary working-man, brought him into a direct struggle with employers and the State, and offered him the image of his future ideal society. It prominently held before him the fact that his salvation lay in his own hands, in the weapons forged by himself, in Direct Action and the General Strike. The Syndicalist working-man could, therefore, now counteract the "pernicious" influence of the political Socialist and work for the social revolution in his own way and through his own organizations. The cause of the working-men was now in safe hands, and his profound yearning for a speedy social emancipation was gratified.

There are several reasons why Syndicalism first developed in France and why it achieved there its most not-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able success. France, before other countries, witnessed those changes in the character of Socialism which were described above. France was the first country to have a Socialist Minister, M. Millerand, and to reveal the "demoralizing" effects of Parliament on the Socialists. France, besides, is rich in revolutionary traditions which at all times fed the revolutionary feelings of the militant working-men. Thirdly, the French Syndicats began to develop only at the time when Socialism was becoming insufficient for the militant working-men, and the latter had therefore little difficulty in capturing the Syndicats. When the General Confederation of Labor *(La Confédération Générale du Travail)* was formed in 1895, it was soon brought under the combined influence of Socialist and Anarchist working-men, who steered the organization in the direction of revolutionary methods and Syndicalist ideas. The success of the General Confederation was due to their energetic action and devotion, and the influence of their ideas grew in consequence. The General Confederation has grown steadily since 1902, and has now about 500,000 members. It consists of local and industrial federations which in their turn are composed of single Syndicats, and presents, from the Syndicalists' point of view, the embryo of the future society.

In England the situation is somewhat different. Syndicalists' ideas had their exponents among English working-men before, and a Syndicalist paper, *The Voice of Labor,* was published in 1907. But Syndicalism did not make headway in England until Tom Mann, an experienced labor-leader, was converted to the new ideas. Tom Mann had spent some years in the labor movement of Australia, and was disappointed by the slowness, uncertainty, and trickery of the political game which the Australian working-men played in the hope of achieving their ends. He then went to France and underwent there the influence of the Syndicalists. Since then Tom Mann has been actively propagating Syndicalist ideas in England. He started a monthly, the *Industrial Syndicalist,* in 1910, and under his influence a Syndicalist organization, "The Industrial Syndicalist Education League," was formed in Manchester toward the end of 1910. The "Syndicalist Education League" is now publishing *The Syndicalist*—a monthly devoted to the propaganda of Syndicalism in England. The new ideas have found numerous adherents, particularly among the working-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men of the building trades, the transport-workers, and the miners. In November, 1910, the English Syndicalists held their first conference in Manchester at which 60,000 workers were represented. Since then their numbers have undoubtedly increased and new industrial groups have been gained. The recent strikes in England show that at least Syndicalist forms of organization and methods are forced upon the working-men by the powerful combinations of employers and by the rather ambiguous policy of the Government. The further development of Syndicalism in England will depend on the success with which the convinced Syndicalists will be able to " bore from within " and to steer the Trade-Unions in the direction of the new doctrine, while the success of their efforts will depend on economic and political conditions.

In America the specter of Syndicalism first appeared in the Lawrence strike. The American Syndicalists, the Industrial Workers of the World, who directed the strike in Lawrence, have been attracting more and more attention since and have been trying to make Syndicalism a factor in American life. American Syndicalism should not be regarded as an importation from France. Of course, American Syndicalists have been more or less in contact with French Syndicalists, but the movement has grown up on American soil and can be traced back to the Knights of Labor. The latter had already formed a vague idea of industrial organization which is so actively propagated by the Industrial Workers of the World. Craft Unionism, however, carried the day in America after 1886, and achieved marked success in the development of the American Federation of Labor. The idea of Industrial Unionism, nevertheless, never died out, and in recent years has been gaining ground under the influence of favorable economic conditions. Finding support among Socialist working-men, the idea of Industrial Unionism was combined with the Socialist conception, and a theory resembling French Syndicalism in the most essential points was the result. This theory was made the basis of the programme adopted by the I. W. W. in 1905.

The Industrial Workers of the World differ, however, from the French Syndicalists in their attitude toward the General Strike. The former conceive the Social Revolution not as a stoppage from work, but as a " staying at work."*

* There is, however, a growing number of Industrial Workers who defend the idea of the Social General Strike.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

According to this idea the working-men will one day declare the means of production common property, but, instead of leaving the factories, will stay there to continue production on a Socialist basis. The difference, however, is rather verbal, for any act having for its purpose such a tremendous change will lead to the interruption of industrial activities at least for some time. The I. W. W. are, besides, more in favor of passive resistance and of other forms of struggle which, though less demonstrative and noisy than the methods of the French Syndicalists, are believed to give the workers a strategic advantage over employers.

Syndicalism is primarily a working-class movement having for its end the solution of the labor problem. But its plans are so far-reaching and involve such profound social changes that society as a whole is necessarily affected. What has, then, Syndicalism to offer to those classes of society which are not occupied in manual labor?

The Syndicalists have recently given some attention to this problem. They have solved it by extending the meaning of labor so as to include all productive work. Teachers, doctors, artists, clerks, and the like have been organized into Syndicats and have joined the army of organized workers. The Syndicalists propose to organize in the same way all those who do some useful work for society, or, as they express it, to "Syndicalize" society. Their idea is to transform society into a federation of self-governing productive groups working together for the benefit of all with instruments belonging to society as a whole and under the supreme control of the community.

From the political point of view, therefore, Syndicalism must be regarded as an attempt to transform the existing political state into an industrial federation. Syndicalism hopes thereby to do away with the arbitrary and coercive aspects of the modern State and to inaugurate an era of expert public service when every man will do his share of the work of society in that field alone in which his knowledge and skill are greatest.

Syndicalism is ready to fight any organization opposed to it and ambitious to absorb all that are friendly to it. It must, therefore, necessarily arouse the hostility not only of the conservative elements of society, but even of reformers and political Socialists.

Louis Levine.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CONSTITUTION AND ITS MAKERS

BY HENRY CABOT LODGE

A LITTLE less than twenty-five years ago great crowds thronged the streets of Philadelphia. Men and women were there from all parts of the United States; the city was resplendent with waving flags and brilliant with all the decorations which ingenuity could suggest, while the nights were made bright by illuminations which shone on every building. Great processions passed along the streets, headed by troops from the thirteen original States, marching in unusual order, with Delaware at the head, because that little State had been the first to accept the great instrument of government which now, having attained its hundredth year, was celebrated in the city of its birth. Behind the famous hall where independence was declared an immense crowd listened to commemorative speakers, and the President of the United States, a Democrat, honored the occasion with his presence and his words.

Two years later, in 1889, the same scenes were repeated in New York. Again the cannon thundered and again flags waved above the heads of the multitude gathered in the streets, through which marched a long procession, both military and civil, headed as before by the representatives of the original thirteen States. Again, at a great banquet, addresses were delivered, and once more the President of the United States, this time a Republican, honored the occasion by his presence and in the name of all the people of the country praised the great work of our ancestors.

In Philadelphia we celebrated the one-hundredth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States. In New York we commemorated the one-hundredth anniversary of the inauguration of the Government which that Constitution had brought into being. Through all the rejoicings of those days, in every spoken and in every writ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ten word, ran one unbroken strain of praise for the great instrument and of gratitude to the men who, in the exercise of the highest wisdom, had framed it and brought it forth. All men recalled that it had made a nation from thirteen jarring States; that it had proved in its interpretation flexible to meet new conditions and strong to withstand injustice and wrong; that it had survived the shock of civil war; and that under it liberty had been protected and order maintained. The pæan of praise rose up from all parts of this broad land unmarred by a discordant note. Every one agreed with Gladstone's famous declaration that the Constitution of the United States was the greatest political instrument ever struck off on a single occasion by the minds of men. We seemed, indeed, by all we then said and did, to justify those foreign critics who reproached us for our blind reverence for our Constitution and our almost superstitious belief in its absolute wisdom and unexampled perfections.

Those celebrations of the framing of the Constitution and of the inauguration of the Government have been almost forgotten. More than twenty years have come and gone since the cheers of the crowds which then filled the streets of New York and Philadelphia—since the reverberations of the cannon and the eloquent voices of the orators died away into silence. And with those years, not very many after all, a change seems to have come in the spirit which at that time pervaded the American people from the President down to the humblest citizen in the land. Instead of the universal chorus of praise and gratitude to the framers of the Constitution the air is now rent with harsh voices of criticism and attack, while the vast mass of the American people, still believing in their Constitution and their Government, look on and listen, bewildered and confused, dumb thus far from mere suprise, and deafened by the discordant outcry so suddenly raised against that which they have always reverenced and held in honor. Many excellent persons believe apparently that beneficent results can be attained by certain proposed alterations in the Constitution, often without examination of the history and theory of government and without measuring the extent or weighing the meaning of the changes which are urged upon us. But it is also true that every one who is in distress, or in debt, or discontented, now assails the Constitution merely be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause such is the present passion. Every reformer of other people's misdeeds—all of that numerous class which is ever seeking to promote virtue at somebody else's expense—pause in their labors to point out the supposed shortcomings of our National Charter. Every raw demagogue, every noisy agitator, incapable of connected thought and seeking his own advancement by the easy method of appealing to envy, malice, and all uncharitableness—those unlovely qualities in human nature which so readily seek for gratification under the mask of high-sounding and noble attributes —all such people now lift their hands to tear down or remake the Constitution. In House and Senate one can hear attacks upon it at any time and listen to men deriding its framers and their work. No longer are we criticized by outsiders for having a superstitious reverence for our Constitution. Quite recently an article by an English member of Parliament (Mr. L. T. Hobhouse), a Liberal, I believe, with Socialist proclivities, declared that this reproach of an undue veneration for the Constitution ought no longer to be brought against us, because beneficent and progressive spirits were already beginning to pull it to pieces and were seeking to modernize it in conformity with the clamor of the moment. All this is quite new in our history. We have as a people deeply reverenced our Constitution. We have realized what it has accomplished and what protection it has given to ordered freedom and individual liberty. Even the Abolitionists, when they denounced the Constitution for the shelter which it afforded to slavery, did not deny its success in other directions, and their hostility to the Constitution was one of the most deadly weapons used against them.

The enmity to the Constitution and the attacks upon it which have developed in the last few years present a situation of the utmost gravity. If allowed to continue without answer they may mislead public opinion and produce the most baneful results. The people of the United States may come to believe that all these attacks are, in a measure at least, true. And therefore if they are not true their falsity ought to be shown. Beside the question of the maintenance or destruction of the Constitution of the United States all other questions of law and policy sink into utter insignificance. In its presence party lines should disappear and all sectional differences melt away like the early mists of dawn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before the rising sun. The Constitution is our fundamental law. Upon its provisions rests the entire fabric of our institutions. It is the oldest of written constitutions. It has served as a model for many nations both in the Old World and in the New. It has disappointed the expectations of those who opposed it, convinced those who doubted, and won a success beyond the most glowing hopes of those who put faith in it. Such a work is not to be lightly cast down or set aside, or, which would be still worse, remade by crude thinkers and by men who live only to serve and flatter in their own interest the emotion of the moment. We should approach the great subject as our ancestors approached it—simply as Americans with a deep sense of its seriousness and with a clear determination to deal with it only upon full knowledge and after the most mature and calm reflection. The time has come to do this, not only here and now, but everywhere throughout the country.

Let us first consider who the men were who made the Constitution and under what conditions they worked. Then let us determine exactly what they meant to do—a most vital point, for much of the discussion to which we have been treated thus far has proceeded upon a complete misapprehension of the purpose and intent of the framers of the Constitution. Finally, let us bring their work and their purposes to the bar of judgment, so that we may decide whether they have failed, whether in their theory of government they were right or wrong then and now, or whether their work as stood the test of time, is broad, based on eternal principles of justice, and, if rent or mangled or destroyed, would not in its ruin bring disaster and woes inestimable upon the people who shall wreck their great inheritance and, like

> "The base Indian, throws a pearl away,
> Richer than all his tribe."

First, then, of the men who met in Philadelphia in May, 1787, with doubts and fears oppressing them, but with calm, high courage, and with a noble aspiration to save their country from the miseries which threatened it, to lead it out from the wilderness of distractions in which it was wandering blind and helpless, into the light, so that the chaos, hateful alike to God and men, might be ended and order put in its place. It is the fashion just now to speak of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

framers of the Constitution as worthy, able, and patriotic persons whom we are proud to have embalmed in our history, but toward whom no enlightened man would now think of turning seriously for either guidance or instruction, so thoroughly has everything been altered and so much has intelligence advanced. It is commonly said that they dealt wisely and well with the problems of their day, but that of course they knew nothing of those which confront us and that it would be worse than folly to be in any degree governed by the opinions of men who lived under such wholly different conditions. It would seem that this view leaves something to be desired and is not wholly correct or complete. Certainly all wisdom did not die with our fathers and equally it was not born yesterday, and a study of history tends to make a man give more weight to the teachings of the past than it is now thought they deserve. Surely there is something to be learned from the men who established the Government of the United States, and their opinions, the result of much and deep reflection, cannot be without value even to the wisest among us.

On questions of this character their ideas and conclusions are not lightly to be put aside; for, after all, however much we may now gently patronize them as good old patriots long since laid in their honored graves, they were none the less very remarkable men, who would have been eminent in any period of history, and might even, if alive now, attain to distinction. Let us glance over the list of delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. To begin with, that their average age was forty-three, which is not an extreme senectitude, and the ages range from Franklin, who was eighty-one, to John Francis Mercer, of Virginia, who was twenty-eight. Among the older men who were conspicuous in the convention were Franklin, with his more than eighty years; Washington, who was fifty-five; Roger Sherman, who was sixty-six; and Mason and Wythe, of Virginia, who were both sixty-one. But when I looked to see who were the most active forces in that convention I found that the New Jersey plan was brought forward by William Paterson, who was forty-two; that the Virginia plan was proposed by Edmund Randolph, who was thirty-four; while Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, whose plan played a large part in the making of the Constitution, was only twenty-nine. The greatest single argument, per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

haps, which was made in the convention was that of Hamilton, who was thirty. The man who contributed more, possibly, than any other to the daily labors of the convention and who followed every detail was Madison, who was thirty-six. The Connecticut compromise was very largely the work of Ellsworth, who was forty-two; and the committee on style, which made the final draft, was headed by Gouverneur Morris, who was thirty-five. Let us note, then, at the outset, that youth and energy, abounding hope, and the sympathy for the new times stretching forward into the great and uncharted future, as well as high ability, were conspicuous among the men who framed the Constitution of the United States.

Their presiding officer was Washington, one of the great men of all time, who had led the country through seven years of war, and of whom it has been said by an English historian that "no nobler figure ever stood in the forefront of a nation's life." Next comes Franklin, the great man of science, the great diplomatist, the great statesman and politician, the great writer; one of the most brilliant intellects of the eighteenth century, who in his long life had known cities and men as few others have ever known them. There was Hamilton, one of the greatest constructive minds that modern statesmanship has to show, to whose writings German statesmen turned when they were forming their Empire forty years ago and about whom in these later days books are written in England, because Englishmen find in the principal author of the *Federalist* the great exponent of the doctrines of successful federation. There, too, was Madison, statesman and lawmaker, wise, astute, careful, destined to be, under the Government which he was helping to make, Secretary of State and President. Roger Sherman was there, sagacious, able, experienced; one of the leaders of the Revolution and signer of the Declaration of Independence, as he was of the Constitution. Great lawyers were present in Philadelphia in that memorable summer of 1787, such men as Ellsworth and Wilson and Mason and Wythe. It was, in a word, a very remarkable body which assembled to frame a constitution for the United States. Its members were men of the world, men of affairs, soldiers, lawyers, statesmen, diplomatists, versed in history, widely accomplished, deeply familiar with human nature. So without an undue or slavish reverence for the past or for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men of a former generation, we may fairly say that in patriotism and in intellect, in knowledge, experience, and calmness of judgment, these framers of the Constitution compare not unfavorably with those prophets and thinkers of to-day who decry the work of 1787, would seek to make it over with all modern improvements, and who with unconscious humor declare that they are engaged in the restoration of popular government.

That phrase is in itself suggestive. That which has never existed cannot be restored. If popular government is to be restored in the United States it must have prevailed under the Constitution as it is, and yet those, who just now are so devoured by anxiety for the rights of the people, propose to effect the restoration they demand by changing the very Constitution under which popular government is admitted by their own words to have existed. I will point out presently the origin of this confusion of thought. It is enough to say now that for more than a century no one questioned that the government of the Constitution was in the fullest sense a popular government. In 1863 Lincoln, in one of the greatest speeches ever uttered by man, declared that he was engaged in trying to save government by the people. Nearly thirty years later, when we celebrated the one-hundredth anniversary of the Constitution, the universal opinion was still the same. All men then agreed that the Government which had passed through the fires of civil war was a popular government. Indeed, this novel idea of the loss of popular government which it is proposed to restore by mangling the Constitution under which it has existed for more than a century is very new—in fact, hardly ten years old.

This first conception of our Constitution as an instrument of popular government, so long held unquestioned, was derived from the framers of the Constitution themselves. They knew perfectly well that they were founding a government which was to be popular in the broadest sense. The theory now sedulously propagated, that these great men did not know what they were about, or were pretending to do one thing while they really did another, is one of the most fantastic delusions with which agitators have ever attempted to mislead or perplex the public mind. The makers of the Constitution may have been right or they may have been wrong in the principles upon which they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acted or in the work they accomplished, but they knew precisely what they meant to do and why they did it. No man in history ever faced facts with a clearer gaze than George Washington, and when, after the adjournment of the convention, he said, "We have raised a standard to which the good and wise can repair; the event is in the hands of God," he labored under no misapprenhension as to the character of the great instrument where his name led all the rest.

It is the fashion to say that since then great changes have occurred and wholly new conditions have arisen of which the men of 1787 could by no possibility have had any knowledge or anticipation. This is quite true. They could not have foreseen the application of steam to transportation, or of electricity to communication, which have wrought greater changes in human environment than anything which has happened to man since those dim, prehistoric, unrecorded days when some one discovered the control of fire, invented the wheel, and devised the signs for language, masterpieces of intelligence with which even the marvels of the last century cannot stand comparison. The men of the Constitution could as little have foreseen what the effects of steam and electricity would be as they could have anticipated the social and economic effects of these great inventions or the rapid seizure of the resources of nature through the advances of science and the vast fortunes and combinations of capital which have thus been engendered. Could they, however, with prophetic gaze have beheld in a mirror of the future all these new forces at work, so powerful as to affect the very environment of human life, even then they would not, one thinks, have altered materially the Constitution which they were slowly and painfully perfecting. They would have kept on their way, because they would have seen plainly what is now too often overlooked and misunderstood, that all the perplexing and difficult problems born of these inventions and of the changes, both social and economic, which have followed were subjects to be dealt with by laws as the questions arose, and laws and policies were not their business. They were not making laws to regulate or to affect either social or economic conditions. Their work was not only higher, but far different. They were laying down certain great principles upon which a government was to be built and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by which laws and policies were to be tested as gold is tested by a touchstone.

Upon the work in which they were engaged social and economic changes or alterations in international relations and political conditions, no matter how profound or unforeseen—and none could have been more profound or more unforeseen than those which have actually taken place—had little bearing or effect. They were framing a government, and human nature was the one great and controlling element in their problem. Human nature, with its strength and its weakness, its passions and emotions so often dominating its reason, its selfish desires and its nobler aspirations, was the same then as now. There is no factor so constant in human affairs as human nature itself, and in its essential attributes it is the same to-day as it was among the builders of the Pyramids. As to the principles of government which the framers of the Constitution wished to adapt to that portion of human nature which had gained a foothold on the North American Continent there was little to be discovered. There is no greater fallacy than to suppose that new and fundamental principles of government are constantly to be invented and wrought out. Laws change and must change with the march of humanity across the centuries as its alteration finds in the conditions about it, but fundamental principles and theories of government are all extremely old. The very words in which we must express ourselves when we speak of forms of government are all ancient. Let me recall a few facts which every school-boy knows and which any one can obtain by indulging in that too much neglected exercise of examining a dictionary. Anarchy, for example, is the Greek word "rule" or "command" with the alpha privative in the form of "an" prefixed and means the state of a people without government. Monarchy is the rule of one; oligarchy is the rule of a few. We cannot state what our own Government is without using the word "democracy," which is merely the Greek word δημοκρᾰτία and means popular government or the rule of the people. Aristocracy, ideally as Aristotle had it, is the rule of the best, but even in those days it meant in practice the rule of the best-born or nobles. Plutocracy is the rule of the rich; autocracy, self-derived power—the unlimited authority of a single person. Ochlocracy is the rule of the multitude, for which we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have tried to substitute the hideous compound "mobocracy." As with the words, so with the things of which the words are the symbol; the people who invented the one had already devised the other. The words all carry us back to Greece, and all these various forms of government were well known to the Greeks and had been analyzed and discussed by them with a brilliancy, a keenness, and an intellectual power which have never been surpassed. If you will read *The Republic* and *The Laws of Plato,* and supplement that study by an equally careful examination of what Aristotle has to say on government, you will find that those great minds have not only influenced human thought from that time to this, but that there is little which they left unsaid. It is the fashion, for example, to speak of Socialism as if it were something new, a radiant discovery of our own time which is to wipe away all tears. The truth is that it is very old, as old in essence as human nature, for it appeals to the strong desire in every man to get something for nothing and to have some one else bear his burdens and do his work for him. As a system it is amply discussed by Plato, who, in *The Republic,* urges measures which go to great extremes in this direction. In the fourth century of our era a faction called the Circumcellions were active as Socialists and caused great trouble within the weakening Empire of Rome. The real difficulty historically with the theories of Socialism is not that they are new, but that they are very, very old, and wherever they have been put in practical operation on a large scale they have resulted in disorder, retrogression, and in the arrest of civilization and progress. Broadly stated, there have been only two marked additions to theories or principles of government since the days of the Greeks and the Romans. One is the representative principle developed by the people of England in the "Mother of Parliaments" and now spread all over the world, and the other is the system of federation on a large scale embracing under a central government of defined powers a union of sovereign and self-governing States which the world owes in its bold and broad application to the men who met at Philadelphia to frame our Constitution in 1787.

With these exceptions the framers of the Constitution dealt with the theories and systems of government which have been considered, discussed, and experimented with for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than two thousand years, and which are to-day, a century later, the same as in 1787, unchanged and with no additions to their number. In order to reach the essence of what the makers of the Constitution tried and meant to do, which it is most important to know and reflect upon deeply before we seek to undo their work, let us begin by dismissing from our consideration all that is unessential or misleading. Let us lay aside first the word republic, for a republic denotes a form and not a principle. A republic may be democratic like ours, or an autocracy like that of Augustus Cæsar, or an oligarchy like Venice, or a changing tyranny like some of those visible in South America. The word has become as inaccurate, scientifically speaking, as the word monarchy, which may be in reality a democracy as in England or Norway, constitutional as in Italy, or a pure despotism as in Russia. Let us adhere in this discussion to the scientifically exact word "democracy." Next let us dismiss all that concerns the relations of the States to the National Government. Federation, as has been said, was the great contribution of the Philadelphia convention to the science of government. The framers of the Constitution, if they did not invent the principle, applied it on such a scale and in such a way that it was practically a discovery, a venture both bold and new, as masterly as it was profoundly planned. With the love of precedents characteristic of their race they labored to find authority and example in such remote and alien arrangements as the Achean League and the Amphictyonic Council, but the failure of these precedents as such was the best evidence of the novelty and magnitude of their own design. Their work in this respect has passed through the ordeal of a great war; it has been and is to-day the subject of admiration and study on the part of foreign nations, and not even the most ardent reformer of this year of grace would think, in his efforts to restore popular government, of assailing the Union of Sovereign States. Therefore we may pass by this great theme which was the heaviest part of the task of our ancestors.

In the same way we may dismiss, much as it troubled the men of 1787, all that relates to the machinery of government, such as the electoral college, the tenure of office, the methods of electing Senators and Representatives, and the like. These matters are important; many active thinkers in public life seek to change them, not for the better, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

none the less these provisions concern only the mechanism of government; they do not go to the root of the matter, they do not affect the fundamental principles on which the Government rests.

By making these omissions we come now to the vital point, which is, What kind of a government did the makers of the Constitution intend to establish and how did they mean to have it work? They were, it must be remembered, preparing a scheme of government for a people peculiarly fitted to make any system of free institutions work well. The people of the United Colonies were homogeneous. They came in the main from Great Britain and Ireland, with the addition of the Dutch in New York, of some Germans from the Palatinate, and of a few French Huguenots, whose ability and character were as high as their numbers were relatively small. But an overwhelming majority of the American people in 1787 were of English and Scotch descent, and they, as well as the others from other lands, were deeply imbued with all those principles of law which were the bulwarks of English liberty. In this new land men had governed themselves and there was at that moment no people on earth so fit for or so experienced in self-government as the people of the Thirteen Colonies. Their colonial governments were representative and in essence democratic. They became entirely so when the Revolution ended and the last English governor was withdrawn. In the four New England Colonies local government was in the hands of the town meetings, the purest democracies then or now extant, but it is best to remember, what the men of 1787 well knew, that these little democracies moved within fixed bounds determined by the laws of the States under which they had their being.

For such a people, of such a character, with such a past and such habits and traditions, only one kind of government was possible, and that was a democracy. The makers of the Constitution called their new Government a Republic, and they were quite correct in doing so, for it was of necessity republican in form. But they knew that what they were establishing was a democracy. One has but to read the debates to see how constantly present that fact was to their minds. Democracy was then a very new thing in the modern world. As a system it had not been heard of, except in the fevered struggles of the Italian City Republics, since

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the days of Rome and Greece, and, although the convention knew perfectly well that they were establishing a democracy and that it was inevitable that they should do so, some of them regarded it with fear and all with a deep sense of responsibility and caution. The logical sequence as exhibited in history and as accepted by the best minds of the eighteenth century, struggling to give to men a larger freedom, was democracy—anarchy—despotism. The makers of the Constitution were determined that so far as in them lay the American Republic should never take the second step, never revolve through the vicious circle which had culminated in empire in Rome, in the tyrants of the Grecian and the despots of the Italian cities, which in their turn had succumbed to the absolutism of foreign rulers.

The vital question was how should this be done; how should they establish a democracy with a strong government—for after their experience of the confederation they regarded a weak government with horror—and at the same time so arrange the government that it should be safe as well as strong and free from the peril of lapsing into an autocracy on the one hand, or into disorder and anarchy on the other? They did not try to set any barrier in the way of the popular will, but they sought to put effective obstacles in the path to sudden action which was impelled by popular passion, or popular whim, or by the excitement of the moment. They were the children of the "Great Rebellion" and the "Blessed Revolution" in the England of the seventeenth century, and they were steeped in the doctrine of limiting the power of the King. But here they were dealing with a sovereign who could not be limited, for while a king can be limited by transferring his power to the people, when the people are sovereign their powers cannot be transferred to anybody. There is no one to transfer them to, and if they are taken away the democracy ceases to exist and another government, fundamentally different, takes its place.

The makers of the Constitution not only knew that the will of the people must be supreme, but they meant to make it so. That which they also aimed to do was to make sure that it was the real will of the people which ruled and not their momentary impulse, their well-considered desire and determination and not the passion of the hour, the child, perhaps, of excitement and mistake inflamed by selfish ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peals and terrorized by false alarms. The main object, therefore, was to make it certain that there should be abundant time for discussion and consideration, that the public mind should be thoroughly and well informed, and that the movements of the machinery of government should not be so rapid as to cut off due deliberation. With this end in view they established with the utmost care a representative system with two chambers and an executive of large powers, including the right to veto bills. They also made the amendment of the Constitution a process at once slow and difficult, for they intended that it should be both, and indeed that it should be impracticable without a strong, determined, and lasting public sentiment in favor of change.

Finally, they established the Federal judiciary, and in the Supreme Court of the United States they made an addition to the science of government second only in importance to their unequaled work in the development of the principle of federation. That great tribunal has become in the eyes of the world the most remarkable among the many remarkable solutions devised by the Convention of 1787 for the settlement of the gravest governmental problems. John Marshall, with the intellect of the jurist and the genius of the statesman, saw the possibilities contained in the words which called the court into being. By his interpretation and that of his associates and their successors the Constitution attained to flexibility and escaped the rigidity which then and now is held up as the danger and the defect of a written instrument. In their hands the Constitution has been expanded to meet new conditions and new problems as they have arisen. In their hands also the Constitution has been the protection of the rights of States and the rights of men, and laws which violated its principles and its provisions, have been set aside.

By making the three branches of the Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—entirely separate and yet co-ordinate, and by establishing a representative system and creating a Supreme Court of extraordinary powers, the framers of the Constitution believed that they had made democracy not only all-powerful, but at the same time safe, and that they had secured it from gradual conversion into autocracy on the one hand and from destruction by too rapid motion and too quick response to the passions of the moment on the other. If ever men were justified by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

results they have been. The Constitution in its development and throughout our history has surpassed the hopes of its friends and utterly disappointed the predictions and the criticisms of its foes. Under it the United States has grown into the mighty Republic we see to-day. New States have come into the Union, vast territories have been acquired, population and wealth have increased to a degree which has amazed the world, and life, liberty, and property have been guarded beneath the flag which is at once the symbol of the country and of the Constitution under which the Nation has risen to its high success. Such results would seem to be a potent argument in favor of the instrument of government through which they have been achieved. But to argue from results seems just now out of fashion. Actual accomplishment, it would appear, is nothing. According to the new dispensation our decision must be made on what is promised for the future, not on what has been done in the past. Under this novel doctrine we are to be guided only by envy and discontent and are to act exclusively on the general principle that whatever is is wrong.

What, then, is the plan by which popular government, which existed under the Constitution for more than a century and which has been mysteriously lost during the past few years, is to be restored to us? It is proposed, to put it in a few words, to remove all the barriers which the makers of the instrument established in order to prevent rash, hasty, and passionate action and to secure deliberation, consideration, and due protection for the rights of minorities and of individuals. This is to be accomplished in two ways: by emasculating the representative system through the compulsory initiative and referendum and by breaking down the courts through the recall. These are the changes by which it is intended to revive popular government. Incidentally they strike at the very heart of the Constitution as the framers planned and made it, for they will convert the deliberate movement of the governmental machinery, by which its makers intended to secure to democracy both permanence and success, into an engine which starts at the touch of an electric button, which is as quick in response as a hair-trigger pistol and as rapid in operation as a self-cocking revolver. These new and precious ideas are of a ripe age; in fact they have passed many hundreds of years beyond the century fixed by Dr. Johnson

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the establishment of a literary reputation at a point where it might be intelligently discussed. Let us therefore consider and criticize them.

The compulsory initiative and the compulsory referendum need not detain us long, for the effect of those devices is obvious enough. The entire virtue or the entire vice—each of us may use the word he prefers—of these schemes rests in the word "compulsory." The initiative without compulsion is complete in the right of petition secured by the first of the first ten amendments to the Constitution, which really constituted a Bill of Rights. The right of petition became the subject of bitter controversy at a later time and was vindicated once for all by John Quincy Adams's great battle in its behalf more than three-quarters of a century ago. There are few instances where petitions representing a genuine popular demand have not met a response in action, whether in Congress or in the State legislatures; still fewer where respectful attention and consideration have not been accorded to them. But the responsibility for action and the form such action should take have rested with the representative body. When the initiative is made compulsory a radical change is effected. A minority, sometimes a small minority of the voters, always a small minority of the people, can compel the legislature to pass a law and submit it to the voters even when a very large majority of the people neither ask for nor, so far as the evidence goes, desire it. In this way all responsibility is taken from the representative body and they become mere clerks for drafting and recording laws, poor puppets who move mechanically when some irresponsible outsiders twitch the strings. It is the substitution of government by factions and fractions for government by the people. The representative body as hitherto constituted represented the whole people. Under the new plan it is to be merely the helpless instrument of a minority, perhaps a very small minority, of the voters.

The voluntary referendum has always existed in this country. In the National Government, owing to our dual or Federal form, the referendum on constitutional amendments is necessarily made to the States, and it has never been suggested for the laws of the United States owing to both physical and constitutional difficulties. In the States the referendum has always been freely used, not only for constitutions and constitutional amendments, but for laws,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

especially for city charters, local franchises, and the like. But if, on the demand of a minority of the voters, the referendum is made compulsory, all responsibility vanishes from the representative body. The representative no longer seeks to represent the whole people or even his own constituency, but simply votes to refer everything to the voters and covers himself completely by pointing to the compulsory referendum. On the other hand, the voters are called upon to legislate. Of the mass of measures submitted they know and can know nothing. Experience shows that in all referendums a large proportion of the voters decline to vote. Whether this is due to indifference or to lack of information the result is the same. It proves that this system demands from the voters what the most intelligent voters in the world are unable to give. They are required to pass upon laws, many of which they have neither time nor opportunity to understand, without deliberation and without any discussion except what they can gather from the campaign orator, who is, as a rule, interested in other matters, or from an occasional article in a newspaper. They cannot alter or amend. They must vote categorically "yes" or "no." The majority either fails to vote, and the small and interested minority carries its measure, or the majority, in disgust, votes down all measures submitted, good and bad alike, because they do not understand them and will not vote without knowing what their votes mean.

The great laws which, both in England and the United States, have been the landmarks of freedom and made ordered liberty possible were not passed and never could have been perfected and passed in such a way as this. This new plan is spoken of by its advocates as progressive. As a matter of fact, it is the reverse of progressive, it is reactionary. Direct legislation by popular vote was familiar, painfully familiar, to Greece and Rome. In both it led through corruption, violence, and disorder to autocracy and despotism. The direct-vote system also proved itself utterly incapable of the government of an extended empire and of large populations. Where government by direct vote miserably failed, representative government, after all deductions have been made, has brilliantly succeeded. The development of the principle and practice of representative government was, as already pointed out, the one great contribution of modern times to the science of government. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has shown itself capable of preserving popular government and popular rights without the violence and corruption which resulted of old in anarchy and despotism, and at the same time it has proved its adaptability to the management of large populations and the efficient government of great empires. Representative government was an enormous advance over government by the direct vote of the forum, the agora, or the market-place, which had preceded it, and which had gone down in disaster. It is now proposed to abandon that great advance and to return to the ancient system with its dark record of disorder and failure. This is not progress. It is retreat and retrogression. It is the abandonment of a great advance and a return to that which is not only old and outworn, but which history and experience have alike discredited.

Look now for a moment at representative government as we ourselves have known it. Let us not forget, in the first place, that the Congress of the United States under the Constitution has been in continuous existence for more than 120 years; that, with the single exception of the "Mother of Parliaments," it is much the oldest representative body of a constitutional character now existing in the world. Let us also remember that the history of the American Congress is in large part the history of the United States and that we are apt to be proud of that history as a whole and of the many great things we as a people have accomplished. Yet whatever praise history accords to the Congress of the United States in the past, the Congress of the moment and the members of that body in either branch receive but little commendation from their contemporaries. This is perhaps not unnatural, and it certainly has always been customary. Legislative bodies have rarely touched the popular imagination or appeared in a dramatic or picturesque attitude. The Conscript Fathers, facing in silence the oncoming barbarians of Gaul; Charles the First, attempting to arrest the five members; the Continental Congress adopting the Declaration of Independence; the famous Oath of the Tennis Court are almost the only instances which readily occur to one's mind of representative and legislative bodies upon whom for a brief instant has rested the halo of heroism and from which comes a strong appeal to the imagination. The men who fight by land and sea rouse immediate popular enthusiasm, but a body of men engaged in legislation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does not and cannot offer the fascination or the attraction which are inseparable from the individual man who stands forth alone from the crowd in any great work of life, whether of war or peace.

We may accept without complaint this tendency of human nature, but every dispassionate student of history, as well as every man who has had a share in the work of legislation, may rightfully deprecate the indiscriminate censure and the consistent belittling which pursue legislative bodies. This attitude of mind is not confined to the United States. The press of England treats its Parliament severely enough, although on the whole with more respect than is the case with the American press in regard to the American Congress. But running through English novels and essays we find, as a rule, the same sneer at the representatives of the people as we do here. Very generally, both in this country and abroad, those who write for the public seem to start with the proposition that to be a member of Congress or a member of Parliament, or a member of the Chamber of Deputies in France, implies some necessary inferiority of mind or character. This theory deserves a moment's examination and is perhaps open to some doubt. As Mr. Reed once said, it is a fair inference that a man who can impress himself upon 200,000 people, or upon the whole population of a great State, sufficiently to induce them to send him to the House or Senate has something more than ordinary qualities and something more than ordinary force. Then, again, as Edmund Burke remarked, you cannot draw an indictment against a whole people, nor, one may add, can you draw an indictment against an entire class. There are good men and bad men in business and in the professions, in the ministry, in medicine, in law, and among scholars. Virtue is not determined by occupation. There are good and bad men in every profession and calling, among high and low, rich and poor, and the honest men who mean to do right largely preponderate, for if they did not the whole social structure would come crashing to the ground. What is true of business and the professions is true of Congress. There are good and bad men in public life, and the proportion of good to bad, I believe, compares favorably with that of any other occupation. Public men live in the fierce light which beats upon them as upon the throne, a light never fiercer or more pitiless than now, and for this reason their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shortcomings are made more glaring and their virtues by contrast more shadowed than in private life. This is as it should be, for the man who does wrong in private life is far less harmful than the public servant who is false to his trust. To inflict upon the public servant who is a wrongdoer the severest reprobation is necessary for the protection of the community, but for this very reason we should be extremely careful that no reprobation should be visited unjustly on any public man. It is an evil thing to betray the public trust, but it is an equally evil thing to pour wholesale condemnation upon the head of every man in public life, good and bad alike. That which suffers most from an injustice like this in the long run is not the public servant who has been unfairly dealt with, for the individual passes quickly, but the country itself. After all, the voters make the Representative. If he is not of the highest type, he appears to be that which the majority prefers. Wholesale criticism and abuse of the Representatives reflect more on the constituencies, if we stop to consider, than on those whom the constituencies select to represent them. Indiscriminate condemnation and equally indiscriminate belittling of the men who make and execute our laws, whether in State or Nation, is not only a reflection upon the American people, but is a blow to the United States and every State in it. They help the guilty to escape and injure the honest and the innocent. They destroy the people's confidence in their own government and lower the country in the eyes of foreign nations.

The Congress of the United States embodies the representative principle. The principle of representation has been the great contribution of the English-speaking race to the science and practice of government.

It is also to be remembered that the representative principle has been coincident with political liberty. Whatever its shortcomings or defects, and, like all things human, it has its grave defects, it none the less remains true that the first care of every "strong man," every "savior of society," every "man on horseback," of every autocrat, is either to paralyze or to destroy the representative principle. It may be that the representative principle is not the cause of political liberty, but there can be no question whatever that the two have always gone hand in hand and that the destruction of one has been the signal for the downfall

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the other. The Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the several States embody the representative principle. By that principle our laws have been made and the republican form of government sustained for more than a century. Whatever its shortcomings, it has maintained the Government of the United States and upheld law and order throughout our borders.

The framers of our Government separated the executive from the legislative branch. They deemed both essential to freedom. The constitution of Massachusetts declares that the government it establishes is to be a government of laws and not of men—a noble principle and one worthy of fresh remembrance. With such a history, and typifying as it does the great doctrines which were embodied in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the institutions of England, it may fairly be asked that if the representative principle must be criticized, as it should be, with severity when it errs, it should also be treated with that absolute justice which is not only right in the abstract, but which is essential to the maintenance of law, order, and free government, to human progress, and to the protection of the weak, even as the fathers designed that it should be. When we blame its failures let us not forget its services. They have broadened freedom down from precedent to precedent. They shine across those pages of history which tell the great story of the advance of liberty and of the ever-widening humanity which seeks to make the world better and happier for those who most need happiness and well-being. In beneficent results for the people at large no other form of government ever attempted can compare with it for a moment.

The worst feature of the compulsory initiative and referendum lies therefore in the destruction of the principle of representation. Power without responsibility is a menace to freedom and good government. Responsibility without power is inconceivable, for no man in his senses would bear such a burden. But when responsibility and power are both taken away, whether from the executive or the representatives, the result is simple inanition. No man fit by ability and character to be a representative would accept the office under such humiliating conditions. Those who accepted it would do so for the pecuniary reward which the office carried and would sink rapidly into mere machines

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of record, neither knowing nor caring what they did. With a representative body thus reduced to nothingness we are left with the people, armed only with their votes, and with an executive who has necessarily absorbed all the real powers of the State. This situation is an old story and has always ended in the same way. It presents one of those rare cases in which the teaching of history is uniform. When the representative principle has departed and only its ghost remains to haunt the Capitol, liberty has not lingered long beside its grave. The rise of the representative principle and its spread to new lands to-day marks the rise of popular government everywhere. Wherever it has been betrayed or cast down the government has reverted to despotism. When representative government has perished freedom has not long survived.

Most serious, most fatal indeed are the dangers threatened by the insidious and revolutionary changes which it is proposed to make in our representative system, upon which the makers of the Constitution relied as one of the great buttresses of the political fabric which was to insure to popular government success and stability. Yet even these changes are less ruinous to the body politic, to liberty, and order than that which proposes to subject judges to the recall. No graver question has ever confronted the American people.

The men who framed the Constitution were much nearer to the time when there was no such thing as an independent judiciary than we are now. The bad old days, when judges did the bidding of the King, were much more vivid to them than to us. What is a commonplace to us was to them a comparatively recent and a hardly won triumph. The fathers of some of those men—the grandfathers of all—could recall Jeffreys and the "Bloody Assize." They knew well that there could be no real freedom, no security for personal liberty, no justice, without independent judges. It was for this reason that they established the judiciary of the United States with a tenure which was to last during good behavior and made them irremovable except by impeachment. The makers of the Constitution believed that there should be no power capable of deflecting a judge from the declaration of his honest belief, no threat of personal loss, no promise of future emolument, which could be held over him in order to sway his opinion. This conviction was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ingrained and born with them, as natural to them as the air they breathed, as vital as their personal honor. How could it have been otherwise? The independence of the judiciary is one of the great landmarks in the long struggle which resulted in the political and personal freedom of the English-speaking people. The battle was fought out on English soil. If you will turn to the closing scenes of Henry IV., you will find there one of the noblest conceptions of the judicial office in the olden time ever expressed in literature. It was written in the days of the last Tudor or of the first Stuart, in the time of the Star Chamber, of judges who decided at the pleasure of the King, and when Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor of England, took bribes or gifts. Yet lofty as is the conception, you will see that Shakespeare regarded the judge as embodying the person, the will, and the authority of the King.

We all know how the first two Stuarts used the courts to punish their enemies and to prevent the assertion of political rights, which are now such commonplaces that the fact that they were ever questioned is forgotten. The tyranny of the courts was one of the chief causes which led to the great rebellion, and out of that great rebellion, when the third Stuart had been restored, came the Habeas Corpus Act, which has done more to protect personal liberty than any act ever passed. But the second Charles and the second James had learned nothing as to the judges. They expected them to do their bidding when the King had any interest at stake, and under the last Stuart the courts reached a very low point and the legal history of the time is characterized by the evil name of Jeffreys. When the lawyers went to pay their homage to William of Orange, they were headed by Sergeant Maynard, then ninety years of age. "Mr. Sergeant," said the prince, "you must have survived all the lawyers of your standing." "Yes, sir," said the old man, "and, but for Your Highness, I should have survived the laws too." The condition of the courts was indeed one of the strongest of the many bitter grievances which wrought the revolution that placed William of Orange on the English throne. In the famous Bill of Rights there is no provision in regard to the courts, and it is not quite clear why it was omitted, although, apparently, it was due to an oversight. In any event, it was not forgotten. It was brought forward more than once in Parlia-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, but William announced that he would not assent to any act making the judges independent of the Crown. As his reign drew toward its close, however, he signified that, although he would veto a separate act, he would accept the independence of the judiciary if provided for in the Act of Settlement which was to determine the succession to the throne of England. Therefore we find in the Act of Settlement the clause which declares that the judges shall hold office during good behavior—"*quamdiu se bene gesserint*" —and shall be removable only on the request of both Houses of Parliament.

It is necessary to pause a moment here and consider briefly the provision of the Act of Settlement for the removal of judges on an address by the Houses, because it has been most incorrectly used by persons ignorant probably of its history as a precedent justifying the recall. The clause was inserted not for the purpose of controlling the judges, but to protect them still further against the power of the Crown, by which they had hitherto been dominated. The history of the clause since its enactment demonstrates what its purpose was as well as the fulfilment of that purpose in practice. During the two centuries which have elapsed since William III. gave his assent to the act there has been, so far as I can learn, only one removal on address, that of Sir Jonah Barrington, an Irish judge, in 1806, more than a hundred years ago. There have been several cases where removal was petitioned for, but Barrington's was the only one in which the demand was successful. The procedure employed shows that there is no resemblance whatever between the removal of a judge upon the address of the law-making body and the popular recall. They are utterly different, instituted for different purposes, and the former furnishes in reality a strong argument against the latter. In all the cases of removal or attempted removal by address of Parliament the accused judge was carefully tried before a special committee of each House; he could be heard at the bar of either House, he could and did employ counsel, and could summon and cross-examine witnesses. This process is as far removed from the recall as the zenith from the nadir, for under the recall the accused judge has no opportunity to summon or cross-examine witnesses, to appear by counsel, or to be properly heard and tried. He is obliged, under the recall, to make an appeal by the usual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political methods and at the same time to withstand another candidate, while he is forced to seek a hearing from audiences ignorant of the law and inflamed perhaps against him by passion and prejudice. He has no chance whatever of a fair trial.

Some of our States borrowed this provision of the Act of Settlement when they formed their constitutions. The State of Massachusetts was one of them. The power has been but rarely exercised by the Legislature in the hundred and thirty years which have passed since our constitution was adopted, but it so happened that when I was in the Legislature a case occurred, and I was a member of the committee on the judiciary to whom the petitions were referred. The accused judge was tried as elaborately and fairly as he could have been by any court or by the Senate if he had been impeached. He had counsel, he summoned and cross-examined witnesses, and the trial, for it was nothing less, occupied weeks. The committee reported in favor of removal, but the House rejected the committee's report. Some years later, after a similar trial, the address passed both Houses and the judge was removed by the governor for misdemeanors and malfeasance in office. A mere statement of the procedure shows at once that the removal by address is simply a summary form of impeachment with no relation or likeness to the recall. Removal by address is no more like the recall than impeachment is. If successful, they all result in the retirement of the judge accused, but there the resemblance ends. The makers of the Constitution did not follow the Act of Settlement and adopt the removal on address. They no doubt perceived its advantages, because it made possible the removal of a judge incapacitated by insanity or age or disease without inflicting upon him the stigma of an impeachment, but they also saw that the removal by address might be used for political and personal reasons, of which one instance occurred in Massachusetts, and they probably determined that the risk of its abuse outweighed any possible benefit which might flow from its judicious exercise.

They placed their courts as far as they could on the great heights of justice, above the gusts of popular passion. They guarded them in every possible way. They knew that judges were human and therefore fallible. They knew that the courts would move more slowly than popular opinion or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than Congress, but they felt equally sure that they would in the end follow that public opinion which was at once settled and well considered. All this they did because all history, and especially the history and tradition of their own race, taught them that the strongest bulwark of individual freedom and of human rights was to be found ultimately in an independent court, the corner-stone of all liberty. Their ancestors had saved the judges from the Crown. They would not retrace their steps and make them subject to the anger or the whim of any one else.

> "They wished men to be free,
> As much from mobs as kings,
> From you as me."

The problem which they then solved has in no wise changed. The independence of the judiciary is as vital to free institutions now as then. The system which our forefathers adopted has worked admirably and has commanded the applause of their children and of foreign nations, who, Bacon tells us, are a present posterity. Now it is proposed to tear this all down and to replace the decisions of the court with the judgment of the market-place.

Those who advocate this revolution in our system of government seem to think that a judge should be made responsive to the popular will, to the fleeting majority of one day which may be a minority the next. They would make their judges servile, and servile judges are a menace to freedom, no matter to whom their servitude is due. They talk of a judge's duty to his constituents. A judge on the bench has no constituents and represents no one. He is there to administer justice. He is there not to make laws, but to decide what the law is. He must know neither friend nor foe. He is there to declare the law and to do justice between man and man.

The advocates of the recall seem to believe that with subservient judges glancing timidly to right and left to learn what voters think, instead of looking steadfastly at the tables of the law, the poor will profit and the rich will suffer; that the individual will win and the corporation lose; that the powerful will be crushed and the weak will triumph, while the sword of the recall hangs over the head of the judicial Damocles. If even this were true, nothing could be more fatal. A judge must know neither rich nor poor,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neither strong nor weak. He must know only law and justice. He must never listen to Bassanio's appeal, "To do a great right, do a little wrong." But the theory is in reality most lamentably false. No man fit to be a judge would, with few exceptions, take office under the recall. In the end the bench would be filled by the weak and the unscrupulous. The weak would make decisions to curry favor and hold votes. The unscrupulous would use their brief opportunity to assure their own fortunes, and that assurance could come only from the rich and the powerful, who would thus control the decisions. For the American court we should substitute the Oriental cadi, with the bribe-giver whispering in his ear. If a criminal happened to belong to some large and powerful organization in whose interest the crime was committed, he would have little to fear from a court where a judge subject to the recall presided. We should have courts like those ruled by the Camorra in the days of the Neapolitan Bourbons except that the subservience of the judge would be insured by fear of the recall instead of by dread of assassination. The result would be the same, and certain criminals would become a privileged class and commit their crimes with impunity.

In one of the noblest passages of his letter to the sheriffs of Bristol Edmund Burke says:

"The poorest being that crawls on earth contending to save itself from injustice and oppression is an object respectable in the eyes of God and man."

Without the independent judge those words could never have been written, for before the independent judge alone could the poorest bring hope to contend against injustice. Judges, of course, are human, and therefore err. There have been one or two great cases where the decision of the highest court traveling beyond its province has been reversed and swept away by the overwhelming force of public opinion and the irresistible currents of events. Only too well do we know that we suffer from the abuse of technicalities, from delays which are often a denial of justice, and that the methods of our criminal law are in many States a disgrace to civilization. But all these delays and abuses and miscarriages of justice are within the reach of Congress and legislatures, and these evils can be remedied by statute whenever public opinion demands a reform. Their continued existence is our own fault. Yet when all is said the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

errors of the highest courts are few and the abuses and shortcomings to which I have referred can be cured by our own action. In the great mass of business, in the hundreds of trials which go on day by day and year by year, justice is done and the rights of all protected. We may declare with truth that in the courts as we have known them the poor, the weak, the helpless have found protection and sometimes their only defense. A mob might thunder at the gates, money might exert its utmost power, but there in the court-room the judge could see only the law and justice. The safeguard of the rights and liberties of minorities and individuals, of the weak, and, above all, of the unpopular, as a rule, has been found only in the court. And now it is proposed to undo all this and to make the judges immediately dependent on the will of those upon whom they must pass judgment. If the framers of the Constitution were alive to-day, they would not find a single new condition to affect their faith in an independent judiciary. They would decide now, as they decided then. Are we ready to reverse their judgment and open the door to the flood of evils which will rush into the State as they always have rushed in when in times past the courts were controlled by an outside power?

The destruction of an independent judiciary carries with it everything else, but it only illustrates sharply the general theory pursued by the makers of the Constitution. They established a democracy, and they believed that a democracy would be successful; but they also believed that it could succeed solely through forms and methods which would not make it impossible for the people to carry on their own government. For this reason it was that they provided against hasty action, guarded against passion and excitement, gave ample room for the cooler second thought, and arranged that the popular will should be expressed through representative and deliberative assemblies and the laws administered and interpreted through independent courts. Those who would destroy their work talk continually about trusting the people and obeying the people's will. But this is not what they seek. The statement as they make it is utterly misleading. That for which they really strive is to make the courts and the Congress suddenly and rapidly responsive to the will of a majority of the voters. It matters not that it may be a narrow, an ephemeral, or a fluctu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ating majority. To that temporary majority, which the next year may be changed to a minority, the Congress and the courts must at once respond. Legislation of the most radical, the most revolutionary character may thus be forced upon the country, not only without popular assent, but against the will of the great mass of the people.

The framers of the Constitution made it in the name and for the benefit of the people of the United States; for the entire people, not for any fraction or class of the people. They did not make the Constitution for the voters of the United States. They recognized that the popular will could only be expressed by those who voted and that the expression of the majority must in the end be final. But they restrained and made deliberate the action of the voters by the limitations placed upon the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches, so that the rights of all the people might be guarded and protected against ill-considered action on the part of those who vote. Those who now seek to alter the fundamental principles of the Constitution start with a confusion of terms and a false proposition. They talk glibly of "the people." But they mean the voters, and the voters are not the people, but a small portion of the people, not more than a fifth or a sixth part, who are endowed by law with the power to express what is to be regarded as the popular will. The legal voters are the representatives and trustees of all the inhabitants of the country, of all those under twenty-one to whom the future belongs, of all the women, of all resident aliens, and of all persons not qualified to vote. They are the instrument, the only practicable instrument, for reaching an expression of the popular will; but they are not the people as a whole, for whom and for whose protection the Constitution was made. It was for the protection of the people that the makers of the Constitution made provisions to assure deliberate movement and to prevent hasty, passionate, or ill-considered action. The purpose of those who would destroy the present Constitution is to remove these safeguards and for the "people" of the Constitution substitute, without check, hindrance, or delay, the will of the voters of the moment. They are blind to the awful peril of turning human nature loose to riot among first principles.

But they do not stop even there. Under the system they propose a small minority of the voters, who are themselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a minority of the people, are to have unlimited power to compel the passage of laws. A small minority will be able and, as the experience of the voluntary referendum shows, will in almost every instance contrive to place laws upon the statute-book which the mass of the people really do not desire. A small minority can force the recall of a judge and drive him from the bench. The new system places the actual power in the hands of minorities, generally small, always interested and determined. Instead of government "by the people and for the people" we shall have government by factions, with all the turbulence, disorder, and uncertainty that the rule of factions ever implies. Such a system is a travesty of popular government and the antipodes of true democracy. Under the same conditions of human nature, with no element of decision lacking then that we have now, the framers of the Constitution established the system under which we have flourished and rejected that which it is now proposed to set up and which all experience had shown to be a failure. Their system embodied in the Constitution has proved its efficacy. It has worked well and it has been an extraordinary success. The other, burdened with the failures of centuries, has always trodden the same path which revolves in the well-worn vicious circle from democracy to anarchy, from anarchy to despotism, and then by slow and painful steps back to the high levels of an intelligent freedom and an ordered liberty. Our ancestors sought to make it as impossible as human ingenuity could devise to drag democracy down by the pretense of giving it a larger scope. We are asked to retrace our steps, adopt what they rejected, take up that which has failed, cast down that which has triumphed, and for government by the people substitute the rule of factions led by the eternal and unwearied champions who in the name of the people seek the promotion which they lack.

Such are the questions which confront us to-day, amazing in their existence under a Constitution with such a history as ours. The evils which it is sought to remedy are all, so far as they actually exist, curable by law. No doubt evils exist; no doubt advance, reform, progress, improvements are always needed as conditions change, but they can all be attained by law. There is no need to destroy the Constitution, to wreck the fundamental principles of democracy and of the Bill of Rights embodied in the first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ten amendments, in order to attain to an amelioration of conditions and to a wider and more beneficent social state when statutes can effect all and more than is demanded.

All these questions, all these reforms and revolutions so gloriously portrayed to us, it cannot be said too often, are very old. Their weakness is not that they are new, but that they are time-worn and outworn. The voices which are now crying so shrilly that we must destroy our Constitution and abandon all our principles of government have been heard—

"In ancient days by Emperor and clown."

They are as old as human discontent and human impatience and are as ancient as the flattery which has followed sovereign authority from the days of the Pharaohs to our own.

There is a familiar story, which we all heard as children, of the courtiers of Knut, King of England, a mighty warrior and a wise man, not destitute evidently of humor. These courtiers told the King that the tide would not dare to come in against his command and wet his feet. So he bade them place his chair near the edge of the sea, and the main came silent, flooding in about him, and we all remember the lesson which the King read to his flatterers. Many kings have come and gone since then, and those who still remain now for the most part walk in fetters. But the courtier is eternal and unchanged. He fawned on Pharaoh and Cæsar, and from their day to our own has always been the worst enemy of those he flattered. He and his fellows contended bitterly in France for the privilege of holding the King's shirt, and when the storm broke which they had done so much to conjure up, with few exceptions they turned like cravens and fled. New courtiers took the vacant places. They called themselves friends of the people, but their character was unaltered. They flattered the mob of the Paris streets, shrieking in the galleries of the convention, with a baseness and a falsehood surpassing even those of their predecessors who had cringed around the throne. Where there is a sovereign there will be courtiers, and too often the sovereign has listened to the courtiers and turned his back on the loyal friends who were ready to die for him, but would not lie to him. Too often has the sovereign forgotten that, in the words of one of the most penetrating

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and most brilliant of modern English essayists, "a gloomy truth is a better companion through life than a cheerful falsehood." Across the centuries come those dangerous and insidious voices, and they sound as loudly now and are as false now as ever. They are always at hand to tell the sovereign that at his feet the tide will cease to ebb and flow, that the laws of nature and economic laws alike will at his bidding turn gently and do his will. And the tides move on and the waves rise and the sovereign who has listened to the false and selfish voices is submerged in the waste of waters, while the courtiers have rushed back to safety and from the heights above are already shouting: "The king is dead! Long live the king!"

With a deep reverence for the great men who fought the Revolution and made the Constitution, when they dealt with elemental questions and fundamental principles, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever in human history, one follows them because they have proved their wisdom by their success. I am not ready to say with Donne—

"We are scarce our father's shadow cast at noon—"

but I am more than ready to say I profoundly believe that we should cherish in our heart of hearts the noble and familiar words of the wise son of Sirach:

"Let us now praise famous men and our fathers that begat us. The Lord hath wrought great glory by them through His great power from the beginning. Leaders of the people by their counsels and by their knowledge of learning meet for the people; wise and eloquent in their instructions; all these were honored in their generations and were the glory of their times.

"There be of them, that have left a name behind them, that their praises might be reported. And some there be which have no memorial; who are perished as though they had never been; and are become as though they had never been born; and their children after them. But these were merciful men whose righteousness hath not been forgotten. With their seed shall continually remain a good inheritance, and their children are within the covenant.

"Their seed standeth fast and their children for their sakes. Their seed shall remain forever and their glory shall not be blotted out. Their bodies are buried in peace; but their name liveth forevermore. The people will tell of their wisdom and the congregation will show forth their praise."

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CUBA AND THE CUBAN QUESTION

BY SYDNEY BROOKS

THE last few months have made it abundantly clear that the present year is destined to be a fateful one, possibly a crucial one, in the history of Cuba and of Cuban-American relations. It opened, it may be remembered, with a peremptory note of warning addressed by the American Government to the Cuban President. There will probably always be some question as to how far that note, with its veiled threat of intervention, was justified, and whether it was one of Mr. Knox's characteristic strokes "off his own bat" or whether it was prompted by the Cuban Government itself. There can, however, be no question of its sobering effects. Cuba at the time was passing through a typically Spanish-American "crisis." The veterans of the War of Independence had started a campaign of proscription against all office-holders of Spanish sympathies; they had forced Congress to suspend the Civil Service laws for eighteen months; official heads were falling one by one; the army showed signs of a desire to take a hand in the agitation; and there was good reason to believe that the ferment was rapidly communicating itself to the negroes. Add to all this that the preceding six months had seen a succession of exciting incidents and that four or five candidates were already in the field for the Presidential nomination, clashing, intriguing, denouncing, with increasing vehemence—and there seemed all the material for a lively explosion. It was at that juncture that Mr. Knox caused to be handed to President Gomez a sharply worded admonition, hinting not obscurely that unless the internal situation in the island improved the United States might be obliged to take forcible action. The note was so clearly in line with President Gomez's own interests in the matter that he was believed in many quarters to have himself suggested it. It greatly,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at any rate, strengthened his hands; it enabled him, while decapitating office-holders right and left in compliance with the decrees of the Veterans' Association, to point out that they could only continue their propaganda at the risk of imperiling the very existence of the Republic; it shocked Cuba into momentary tranquillity; and though a disturbing element was afterward introduced by a judgment of the Supreme Court pronouncing the suspension of the Civil Service laws unconstitutional, still the situation has never been so precarious since the presentation of the American note as it was before it.

Other excitements, however, have supervened; and in spite of President Taft's genial denial in March of the many rumors that Washington was contemplating and preparing for another intervention, and in spite of Mr. Knox's visit to Havana in April—where he was received with, perhaps, more politeness than enthusiasm and where his speeches, while reassuring, were not without an undercurrent of shrewd advice—the feeling has steadily grown that Cuba and Cuban-American relations are nearing the rapids. In the last week of May this suspicion was intensified by the news of a negro uprising in the Eastern Province and by the promptness with which the United States, while disclaiming any thought of "intervention," collected and despatched to the disturbed area a strong force of American marines. But all these, while interesting and significant incidents, are not in themselves sufficiently abnormal to make 1912 stand out with any unusual conspicuousness in the Cuban calendar. What really focuses interest on the island and gives rise to the apprehension that in one way or another the present year will leave a decisive mark on its fortunes is, that on November 1st, the Cubans will be electing another President. Even in a country as stable, civilized, and experienced as the United States, it happens from time to time that a Presidential election generates a certain amount of heat and confusion and is apt to throw men off their balance. But in a country like Cuba, where all politics inevitably turn on personalities and the spoils, and are therefore fused through and through with the bitterest contentiousness, the normal excitement of a Presidential campaign becomes little less than a frenzy; and whether the Republic is capable of weathering the tropical tornado that is now rushing upon it is precisely the question

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that 1912 is expected to settle or at least to illumine. Having twice visited the island for the purpose of inquiring into its political and economic conditions, I should like, from the standpoint of an Englishman, to venture some impressions of a problem which, though primarily it concerns Cubans and Americans, is also of interest to all students of politics.

In some ways the experiment of a self-governing Cuba is being tried under conditions more favorable to a happy issue than obtain in the case of any other South or Central American Republic. The United States went into the war with Spain pledged to effect the independence of Cuba. The language in which Congress expressed the national determination was an explicit answer to the European taunt that the war was one of aggression and conquest. Congress resolved "that the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent," and from that went on to affirm "that the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people." The substantial part of this pledge of self-denial has, I think, been adequately fulfilled. The Americans have twice occupied and governed Cuba and have twice voluntarily withdrawn from it. They called a new State into being as they said they would, and they left it to the people of that State to work out their own salvation. But the Republic they hatched was not by any means the "free and independent" power to which the Congressional resolutions pointed. Before turning over the island to the Cubans the Americans took good care to see that their own national interests were amply safeguarded. They imposed conditions and they obliged the Cubans to embody those conditions in their Constitution as part of the organic law of the land; and the Cuban Republic, when it finally stepped on to the international stage, was seen at once to be a wholly new variety of the half-autonomous, half-vassal State. It is bound not to permit any foreign power to acquire control over its territory; not to contract any debt on which the ordinary revenues are insufficient to pay the interest and furnish a sinking-fund for the principal; to lease certain coaling and naval stations to the United States; to continue to improve the sanitation of its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cities; and to allow the American to intervene "for the preservation of Cuban independence and the maintenance of a Government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty."

I do not quarrel with any of these restrictions, though I can well understand the disappointment they caused in Cuba and the suspicion with which they are regarded by other South-American Republics. Americans had the good sense to recognize that in Cuba's own interest it was vital that her relations with the United States should be put on a definite footing, and that the American Government should stand forth as a guarantor that the new-born State was not to be allowed to follow the too familiar course of most Spanish-American Republics. It is, indeed, precisely because the United States is in the near background, vitally concerned for commercial, financial, strategic, and sanitary reasons in Cuba's good behavior, prompt to suppress disorder, and with a veto power over her financial conduct, that one is able to assert that the experiment of self-government is being made under more promising conditions in Cuba than exist anywhere else in or around the southern hemisphere. Cuba cannot go to war; she cannot indulge in the caprices that have earned Venezuela and Nicaragua a noxious immortality; there can be no defaulting in the matter of the debt; she cannot lapse into anything more serious than temporary tumult and confusion; as a field for the investment of capital she offers practically as much security as though she were not merely under the American ægis, but a State in the American Union.

On the other hand, there are many factors pulling in an opposite direction and tending to make an autonomous Cuban Republic an extremely delicate and hazardous enterprise. Their lamentable and tumultuous past has deprived the people of any chance of gaining experience in self-government; they have but barely emerged from four centuries of political servitude and torpor; they inherit a baneful tradition of corruption and of mistrust of all who are set in authority over them, whether Spaniards, Americans, or their own fellow-countrymen; their percentage of illiteracy, while diminishing, is still inordinately high; one-third of them are negroes; they are a people of mixed extraction which has in it no strain that has yet shown political capacity; their climate, while delightful for the transient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

visitor, has the political drawback of making a "revolution" an agreeable pastime and of weakening energy and will-power; the form of government they at present enjoy was not self-evolved, but imposed upon them from without; and as the possessors of a phenomenally rich and undeveloped land they are surrounded by promoters, exploiters, speculators, and concession-hunters whose activities, naturally, do not make for political health. These were the people whom the Americans, without any real preliminary training—for General Wood's administration of Cuba only lasted four years and, while a magnificent record of reforms, could not do more than touch the external aspects of things—presented with a Republic, a written Constitution, and universal suffrage, the three political ingredients that the oldest and most mature and experiencel of peoples have found it hard to blend into a consistent whole.

And besides all these obstacles to honest and stable government, the Cubans have further to contend with the obstacle of the Platt Amendment. In saying that I seem to contradict my testimony of a moment ago to the good sense of the Americans in establishing a suzerainty or protectorate over Cuba and to the value of their presence and authority in the background in promoting security. But the truth is that the Platt Amendment is a double-edged weapon, and a source both of strength and of weakness to the rulers of the island. It strengthens the Cuban Republic because the knowledge that disorder and factional disputes, if carried beyond a certain point, will infallibly involve American intervention, tends to keep political grievances and animosities within bounds—there being nothing that the great majority of the Cuban people so heartily dread and abominate as another American administration of their country. On the other hand, it weakens the Cuban Republic because it sets a premium on insurrectionary violence and puts it in the power of what might be a small and wholly unrepresentative faction to bring about a state of affairs that Americans might find it hard to distinguish from anarchy. Cuba's wealth is mainly sugar, and sugar is a product that both in the field and in the mill is peculiarly exposed to destruction. A torch applied to the cane at the right season, a few bombs judiciously exploded in the mills, a mile or so of railway track torn up, and millions of dollars' worth of property might be destroyed in a few hours. Noth-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing is easier than for a disgruntled Cuban to bring about American intervention by proclaiming himself a general, collecting a few score of loafers, and proceeding to burn and wreck right and left. This enormous and unparalleled power of destruction in a few reckless hands is a factor to be always remembered. The tail in Cuba wags the dog; and every Cuban Government is exposed not merely to the threat of American intervention, but to the ability of its opponents or of any discontented faction to make good that threat. The most perfect and efficient and energetic administration conceivable could not prevent a casual band of vandals from doing immense damage to property, and especially to foreign-owned property, in Cuba; and its failure to suppress any outbreak of the kind would argue nothing as to its competency to discharge all the normal duties of government. Two consequences follow from this state of things. In the first place, a Cuban Government can be blackmailed by its enemies who have it in their power to provoke American intervention if their demands are refused. In the second place, Americans, seeing all the visible signs of disorder, seeing definite danger to "life, property, and individual liberty," are misled into thinking the trouble much more serious than it really is.

But there is another way in which the Platt Amendment operates to Cuba's disadvantage. Not only is it in itself an elastic instrument that could be stretched at need to cover almost anything, but its presence unconsciously suggests to officials at Washington that they have a right to interfere whenever the Cuban Government commits, or contemplates committing, some act of which they disapprove. Any one who has been at all behind the scenes of Cuban politics and administration knows perfectly well that the amount of supervision exercised by the American Minister in Havana goes far beyond the mere terms of the Platt Amendment and is frequently enforced in matters that exclusively concern the Cubans themselves, and that it is mere gallantry to speak of the Cubans as a self-governing people. In this way the Cuban administration is largely deprived of the moral authority that every Government ought to possess, and the political inexperience which it is the sincere wish, I believe, of the American people to remove is really perpetuated. The Cubans never quite know where they are or with whom they are dealing. One day the American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Minister receives instructions from the State Department; the next day he may receive contradictory instructions from the War Department. A habit of meddling with the details of Cuban administration and of hampering and hauling up Cuban Ministers in the discharge of the ordinary functions of government has thus grown up, greatly to the resentment of the rulers of the island and to the serious impairment of whatever sense of responsibility they may possess. To the Platt Amendment they have contrived to accommodate themselves, though they wish that its true scope and meaning could be more definitely defined. But to the constant and inquisitorial form of supervision that is now becoming customary they take strong exception. They believe it to be the forerunner of intervention or, at any rate, of a concerted attempt to govern Cuba without the bother and expense of a formal occupation of the island. The Cubans are a suspicious people and, laughable as it may sound to Americans, they have persuaded themselves that there are officials in the War Department at Washington who are deliberately conspiring against their independence without the knowledge or approval of the American people, and that secret and powerful influences are always at work blackening their character, painting Cuba as a chaos of corruption, and familiarizing the American mind with the idea that intervention is only a matter of time.

It is, I take it, undoubtedly the fact that many American interests in Cuba would prefer to see the Republic extinguished and the island come again under an American, or a joint Cuban-American, government; and that these interests work for intervention just as similar interests fifteen years ago worked to bring Great Britain and the Transvaal to loggerheads. It is also possibly the fact that, in the absence of any great or well-informed public or Congressional interest in Cuba and in the absence, too, of any department specially dedicated to the consideration of the Cuban and of similar questions, a certain incoherency of policy may have been developed and that subordinate officials in the State and War departments at Washington may at times have been more zealous than discreet in their dealings with the Cuban Government. But I have too much faith in the pacific and unaggressive temper of the American people and in the good sense of American statesmen to believe that they will allow themselves to be gulled by self-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seeking "interests," or that they will ever resort to the desperate remedy of armed intervention in Cuba except for causes that would place their action beyond cavil or criticism. So far as I have been able to judge the popular attitude toward the Cuban question, I should say that most Americans wish the island nothing but well, earnestly desire to see the experiment of self-government succeed, do not in the least covet Cuba, and would unhesitatingly reject any proposal to incorporate it in the American Union.

It remains, therefore, to consider whether the Cubans by their own conduct have furnished or are likely to furnish any valid excuse for intervention. What has been their record as a Republic? They have certainly followed the admirable example set them during the first American occupation in matters of sanitation. Not only has yellow fever been stamped out, but the Cuban death rate is to-day the lowest but one in the whole world; and I should be very greatly surprised if questions of public health were ever again to affect Cuban-American relations. Then, again, and especially under the Gomez administration, there has been a steady material development. Foreign capital has poured into the island, highways and railroads and bridges have been multiplied, harbors have been dredged, communications by telephone and telegraph have been greatly extended, the cities are rapidly furnishing themselves with the accessories and conveniences of up-to-date communities, the commerce and productivity of the island have been strikingly stimulated. Cuban credit, moreover, has been well maintained and Cuban securities rank deservedly high on all the leading stock exchanges. Although the administration is conducted on a lavish and undoubtedly extravagant scale, and periodically runs short of money toward the end of each fiscal year, its financial conduct on the whole has been satisfactory. That is to say, the ordinary revenues of the country are amply sufficient to provide interest and sinking-fund on the debt that has been contracted; and so long as that is the case the Platt Amendment, so far as it deals with finance, is necessarily dormant. Then, too, I think it may fairly be said that, in spite of a few sporadic disturbances, the Gomez Government has preserved public peace and order with adequate completeness. It has been a strong government and has not hesitated, whenever necessary, to use the Rural Guards. In that respect, indeed, it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is probably as efficient and determined a government as is ever likely to be established under Cuban auspices; and I question whether there was ever any serious ground for doubting its ability to cope with the recent negro uprising.

But to all this there is another and much less pleasing side. Undoubtedly graft is rampant in Havana and, indeed, throughout the whole island. If it would be an exaggeration to say that the country is being sold block by block, it is well within the truth to say that many concessions have been granted for illicit considerations that ought never to have been granted at all, and that the government is honeycombed with jobbery and corruption. It is true that in most, but not in all cases, the public has benefited by being furnished with facilities that otherwise would not have been forthcoming; but no one seriously disputes the fact that graft has assumed sinister proportions and is one of the main pivots of Cuban politics. Moreover, the fiscal policy of the Government throws a wholly disproportionate burden on the poor, who are still further oppressed by an absence of small holdings and a lack of opportunities for getting credit on any but Asiatic terms, and who are further demoralized by the revival of the lottery. A very competent observer, Mr. Forbes Lindsay, has justly remarked that Cuba presents the curious anomaly of "a highly prosperous country with an extremely needy population." The native Cubans are tending more and more to become the dispossessed employees of alien capitalists, and, were the sugar crop to be ruined by bad weather or were a period of commercial depression to set in, an acute situation would undoubtedly arise. Meanwhile it is enough to note it as a blot and a danger-point that the Cuban Government has shown itself to be far more zealous in the service of "the interests" than in that of "the people."

Another source of peril to the stability of the Republic is politics, meaning by politics not a clash of ideas or of principles, but a ceaseless, feverish struggle of rival personalities and ambitions to get possession of the machinery of government and use it for their own enrichment. All through the Spanish-speaking world politics at bottom are nothing but a faction fight between the Ins and the Outs. In some countries the contest is waged according to fixed rules, one party giving way to the other after a definite period in office and honorably leaving some of the plums

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the enjoyment of its successors. But Cuba has not yet attained to even that moderate height of sobriety and tolerance. Its political struggles are wars to the knife; a group that has once got control of the offices will do anything rather than give them up; honest elections are not considered by anybody as a serious possibility; the natural retort of a defeated party is a "revolution," and in the madness of political revenge there is always a danger of such a tumult as will put the independence of the country in jeopardy. It was from causes similar to these that the Palma Government in 1906 came to its downfall, and nobody who watches the present fury of strife inside the Liberal party can be sure that history will not repeat itself. I never gathered while I was in Cuba that there was much danger of a military revolt, but in the combined influence of graft, of poverty and unemployment, and of politics I found many who foretold the doom of the Republic.

To an outsider it seems as though the question before the American people comes down to this: "What degree of disorder, corruption, misgovernment, and so on, are we prepared to tolerate in Cuba in order that the islanders may continue to test their capacity for ruling themselves?" And if I might venture to indicate the kind of reply that in my opinion ought to be returned to this query, it would take the form of an adjuration to the American people to tolerate just as much as they possibly can. It can only, at best, be after repeated stumblings and backslidings, amid many scandals, with frequent lapses from the democratic ideal, to the accompaniment of a continuous commotion, and by the exercise, on the part of the United States, of an extraordinary patience, sympathy, and forbearance that the Cubans can win their way to political stability. Americans intend, I sincerely believe, to give Cuba every chance. But Cuba as a matter of fact will be given no chance at all if Americans expect from her the impossible and judge her conduct by American or British standards, or by any standards at all that do not take account of her peculiar history and of the temperament, idiosyncrasies, and mental habits of her people. A clean and orderly system of administration is something that the Cubans cannot reasonably be asked to evolve for many years to come. Yet some Americans, I note, apparently ask it of them already. So far as I can see, there is bound to be corruption in Cuban politics,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recurrent unrest, a certain amount of disorder, and, possibly, some bloodshed. All this I take to be inevitable. The question for Americans is whether they will put up with it as an unpleasant but necessary phase of Cuban evolution, or whether they will use it as a reason for making an end of the whole experiment. If they insist that the Cuban Republic shall conform to Anglo-Saxon conceptions of probity and efficiency, then it might just as well not have come into existence. If, on the other hand, they are prepared to overlook much that is harmful and unsatisfactory in Cuban conditions, then the Cuban Republic may not only endure, but may gradually master the supremely complex art of self-government. A literal view of American responsibilities under the Platt Amendment means the speedy end of Cuban autonomy. A liberal view, on the other hand, means, or may mean, its perpetuation. And I need hardly add that another American occupation of the island would be regarded with extreme suspicion and resentment by all the Republics of South America, and would raise a crop of very delicate domestic problems, fiscal and otherwise. It may, of course, come to that in the end. But so far, while there is much in the state of Cuba that one can only regard with grave misgivings, nothing definite has occurred to warrant a third intervention; and if Americans from time to time will turn a tactfully blind eye on what is happening in Havana, and will remember that the shortcomings they deplore can only be really eradicated by the action of the Cubans themselves, there is something more than the possibility that their generous treatment of Cuba may meet the reward it deserves.

SYDNEY BROOKS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR MISSION IN NICARAGUA

BY CHARLES A. CONANT

To many who have not followed closely the ramifications of American diplomacy with the different nations of the earth, the question has perhaps arisen why the United States at the present time should be interesting herself so actively in Central America as to send there her highest executive officer below the President—the Secretary of State. To those familiar with the true conditions, however, the answer to this query is that the United States must interest herself in the maintenance of order and security for life and property, unless she wishes one or more of the leading powers of Europe to intervene. This might mean conflict over the Monroe Doctrine and the assumption of a protectorate by either the United States or a great European power at the threshold of the Panama Canal.

At present American diplomatic influence is being exerted in certain countries of Central America to permit their people to establish such conditions of security and peace as will avoid the necessity of direct interference either by this country or any other. It was to explain our purposes in this respect that Secretary Knox went on his mission of peace and good will to Latin America. It requires actual contact with these peoples to realize how different are their political and social conditions from those of the United States and Western Europe. In the absence of genuine economic development through the use of labor-saving machinery and the orderly, uninterrupted labor of the masses in building homes, investing their savings, and adding to the common fund of wealth, the chief means of acquiring riches quickly is by spoliation. In too many cases the man without scruples who could once grasp the Presidency of one of these countries has been able to keep it by force over a term of years sufficient for him to extort millions from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sweat and suffering of the laboring masses and transfer it to Europe for safe-keeping, until at length the accumulating discontent of those whom he has robbed, and the ambition of others to follow in his footsteps, have compelled him to flit across the ocean, and spend his ill-gotten accumulations in those forms of sensuous vulgarity which represent the chief type of enjoyment to the man without ideals.

It has been thus over and over again in the Southern countries with the Guzman Blancos, the Castros, and the Zelayas of recent years. The evil they have done has had ramifications moral, social, and economic. From the moral point of view, the example has been held out to other unscrupulous adventurers to follow in the same path of spoliation, government by force, and neglect of the honest means of acquiring wealth. From the social point of view, both the classes and the masses have been discouraged from any ambition except that of living by public plunder. Long years of tyranny have bred a fever in the blood, which can only be allayed by other years of quiet discipline in better government. From the economic point of view, there has existed practically the same evil as that of absentee landlordism — that the wealth of the country has been sucked away to be spent in vicious and unproductive luxury in a foreign land. From the fact of robbery of the rich by the tyrant of the moment has come also to the capitalist complete discouragement from the creation of new industries, while to the masses has come the dangerous lesson, that it was as contemptible as it was useless to expend their efforts in honest labor, when they could profit more by joining a revolution and acquiring a military or civil post.

On every hand in Nicaragua are evidences of former years of misgovernment and spoliation. Roads full of gullies, almost impassable except by ox-carts, form the thoroughfares between leading cities. A large producer of milk for the capital, with his ranch close to the Lake of Managua, when asked why he did not send in his product by a steam-launch instead of by ox-carts, replied that if he put a launch on the lake it would be seized at the first outbreak of revolution, either by the government or the revolutionists, and would either be lost entirely to the owner or come back in too dilapidated a condition for further use. The breeding of fine horses has been given over for similar reasons—that whenever revolutionary disturbances break

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out, the ranches are raided and the horses taken for the regular army or that of the revolutionists. Even with the cattle it is much the same. A marauding band of troops will kill them for the meat and leave the carcasses for the vultures.

Such money-making opportunities in Nicaragua as emerged above the storm-clouded horizon of civil war were seized upon by President Zelaya and his followers as sources of personal profit. Leases of the liquor and tobacco industries were made, at small compensation to the government, to joint-stock companies, in which the President of the Republic or his dummy held big blocks of shares. The railway was leased to a separate company, which created a paper capital of $1,200,000 without the investment of a penny, and handed over about a third of the shares to the public-spirited President who had granted the lease. Many minor monopolies were handled in the same manner. Special piers were authorized at certain ports, which importers were compelled to use, in order that heavy wharf charges might be divided up between the original promoters and the powers at the capital. When some of the merchants at Bluefields, many of whom are Americans, asked for a revision of the tariff upon certain necessaries of life, the dictator politely intimated that he had little use for foreigners, and that there were plenty of steamers leaving Bluefields which they could take if they did not like the government. He graciously condescended, however, to promise a revision, which, when it reached Bluefields, proved to be in the nature of a grim joke--duties being reduced on a short list of such vital necessities as castor oil and pepper, without touching important articles of large importation.

Government like this in the Southern countries has rested upon force, and a force which was not exercised with skilful tact by the gloved hand, as in the Rome of Augustus or the Antonines, but with the crude brutality of the tyrant who every moment fears assassination by the husband he has wronged or rebellion by the rival who envies his power and opportunities. The power of President Zelaya, who governed Nicaragua from 1893 to 1909, rested upon the loyalty of the soldiers. A few hundred in each of the leading cities were enough to maintain his authority in the absence of organization and monetary help to his opponents from abroad. Even under the present more lenient government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of President Diaz, the fixed bayonet and the loaded musket are necessary badges of authority and order. A garrison looks down upon the capital, Managua, with loaded machine-guns ready to fire at a moment's notice upon the thoughtless villager or tourist who comes too near them after dark without a password. The fever of militarism in its crudest and most wasteful form has been infused into the blood by years of tyranny and disorder. Although the Nicaraguan army has been reduced to 1,600 men, the rattle of drums, the parade of detachments through the streets, and the presence until recently of files of soldiers at the Government Palaces indicate how completeley government rests upon force.

Since the American intervention against Zelaya in 1909 some of these visible symbols of military rule have been disappearing under the helpful suggestions of Mr. Gunther, the brilliant young American who was until recently Chargé d'Affaires at Managua, and with the co-operation of President Diaz and General Luis Mena, the Minister of War. The rifle-slots with which Zelaya perforated the heavy cement walls of his fortress at the Campo de Marte, on the outskirts of Managua, have been filled up. Policemen are being substituted for soldiers about the public buildings, and the citizens of Grenada are urging the abandonment of the barracks in the heart of the city which form the hateful symbol of Zelaya's long tyranny. But these things can only be done with safety under the friendly influence of America. Every one knows that neither the authority of President Diaz nor that of any one who might be chosen in his place would endure for a week, unassailed by the plotters of revolution, if it was not supported by force visible and tangible or by the overshadowing power of the United States.

Men who opposed Zelaya were robbed of their property and driven into exile. The power of the love of home, however, and the disposition to labor and save even under the most adverse conditions, were well illustrated by the history of the city of Grenada during these years of terror. One of the most prosperous commercial cities of Nicaragua, the heir of a long line of Spanish history and traditions, Grenada was called by Zelaya the "rebellious city" and the "accursed city." Again and again, when he needed money, a notice went to a Grenada merchant, a member of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of the few old families who are the center of the city's life, that he must produce 50,000 or 100,000 pesos within two or three days. On some occasions the demand was enforced by a cordon of soldiers directed to prevent ingress or egress from the house or the delivery of food until the demand was complied with. One of Zelaya's last official decrees (September 17, 1909), frankly announcing a forced loan of 1,000,000 pesos by its name *(imprestito fuerza),* allotted 400,000 pesos to the Department of Grenada, and only 100,000 to each of the other two chief departments—Managua, the capital, and Leon, where the partisans of Zelaya predominated. By Article 3 of this decree the civil head of the city was instructed to notify the "lenders" of their allotment within four days, and by Article 4 to require them to pay in half their quota within three days and the other half within eight days more.

When the citizens of Grenada refused to make Zelaya honorary president of their best club, he broke up the club and confiscated its house. When they held a masked ball, his soldiers dispersed the merry-makers at the point of the pistol. When the city showed undue signs of prosperity, he tore up the tramway. No wonder that in Grenada and elsewhere exist sickness of heart and weariness of spirit over the possibility of these recurring reigns of terrorism, and the hope, often openly expressed, that American influence may be exercised, in some such form as that exercised over Cuba under the Platt Amendment, in order that the long-stunted flowers of peace and order may thrive and blossom.

The United States and European countries are not free from exploitation and dishonest government. But one of the great differences between these advanced commercial countries and those of the South is, that in the Northern countries the enormous productive power of organized industry makes an occasional injustice on the part of the capitalist or government a negligible factor in the progress of the country. Even the millions which are poured out for military and naval purposes in the Northern countries are only the small tribute which productive industry pays for protection; in the South they are the be-all and end-all of those who rely upon force to consummate their ends. Where a laborer can earn only a few cents a day, and has no inducement to work except precariously, he has little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for paying tribute to the higher powers. To take from him much of what he has brings him close to the margin of starvation. Measured by the standards of the Northern countries, the monetary acquisitions of a Castro or a Zelaya, which they have taken out of the country, are insignificant; but in the Northern countries the evolution of eight centuries of civilization has given the assurance that, in spite of occasional wrongs or a heavy burden of taxation, there exist security of property, the right of uninterrupted labor and saving, and protection for life, liberty, and freedom of contract under the ægis of law. In the Northern countries the great amounts taken by taxation are given back to the people in improved roads, deepened harbors, postal facilities, pure water supplies, systems of drainage, hospitals, schools, police and sanitary protection, and even insurance against poverty in old age. In those Southern countries which have submitted to tyrannies like that of Zelaya, roads go unimproved, harbors are closed by the silting of the river sands over the bars, railways fall out of repair, the post-office and the telegraph languish under incompetent administration, and drainage and sanitary precautions are almost unknown.

It is not surprising that under governments like these national bankruptcy, the wreckage of currency systems, the violation of public faith, and shattered national credit have been the rule. In such a condition Nicaragua found herself when at last Zelaya surrendered his power. Many Americans probably rubbed their eyes with astonishment when they read the note addressed by Secretary Knox to the Nicaraguan Government on December 1, 1909, after the murder of the two Americans, Cannon and Groce, by Zelaya's soldiers. The murdered men were more or less adventurers who took the chances of their calling, but Zelaya's long reign of tyranny had at last come to be understood in its true colors at Washington and in the cabinets of Europe. Petty insults to the American Legation had been increasing in frequency. The mail of the Legation was opened and held back; telegrams were deliberately altered; fines were imposed upon men wearing buttons bearing the American flag; and upon the news of the election of President Taft in 1908, a party of Americans and Nicaraguans who met to celebrate the event was broken up, and its chief Nicaraguan members were subjected to jail

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and torture. Minister Coolidge a few days later threw up his commission, declaring that it was "consistent with neither the dignity nor the interests of the United States to maintain a representative" in such a land, where the only rule was that of force.

Still the patient "mules" of the North—the pet name for Americans among their enemies in Central America—were silently submissive. But upon the organization of a strong revolutionary movement on the East Coast, Secretary Knox felt that the time had come to aid the Nicaraguan people by at least refusing longer recognition of the tyrant. Sending his passports to Felipe Rodriguez, the Nicaraguan representative in Washington, he advised him that it was "a matter of common knowledge that under the régime of President Zelaya republican institutions have ceased in Nicaragua to exist except in name; that public opinion and the press have been throttled; and that prison has been the reward of any tendency to real patriotism." Upon receipt of news of this note Zelaya realized at last that his day was over. He knew that his few thousand ill-disciplined and poorly equipped native soldiers could make no stand against the jackies from American war-ships if they landed at Corinto, and that their path to the capital was likely to be a prolonged ovation from a liberated people. Fearing assassination by his enemies, he took a special train at an obscure station outside Managua, slunk away to the seaport, and was there received by the officers of a Mexican gunboat, sent by his sympathetic fellow-ruler who was so soon to follow him into political oblivion.

It was following these events that the United States felt justified in extending advice to the new government of Nicaragua to enter upon a policy of financial and political rehabilitation. Ultimately this advice was accepted. Zelaya turned over the Presidency to a former friend, Dr. Madriz, but his government was short-lived. General Estrada succeeded to the Presidency, but an attempt on his part in May, 1911, to undermine the power of General Mena, his Minister of War, resulted in another change of government. Mena had command of the troops whose menacing machine-guns looked down upon the city of Managua. In a moment when he was away from the barracks, President Estrada put him under arrest and directed the soldiers to lay down their arms and accept a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new commander. The soldiers remained loyal to Mena, and upon this news Estrada followed the course of so many of his predecessors in seeking safety across the frontier. General Mena, however, did not insist upon the Presidency. His friend, Adolfo Diaz, took the position and left Mena at his post as Minister of War.

Señor Diaz is a young man, trained in mercantile enterprises at Bluefields on the East Coast, where he has imbibed American ideas of the value of order and business enterprise. General Mena, of stature much above the ordinary in Nicaragua, bluff, sturdy, reticent, combines with many of the traditions of the soldier an insight into the real needs of his country which has made him a resolute friend of the American loan. Upon his adherence to this attitude, in spite perhaps of some sacrifices of popularity and of personal following, and upon similar loyalty by the big business interests of Grenada and Leon, rests in a large measure the immediate future of Nicaragua.

Even before the fall of Estrada, the Government of Nicaragua had asked the United States to designate a competent specialist to investigate its financial affairs and arrange for a loan to extinguish its debts and to meet accumulating claims. The delicate mission of reconciling political jealousies fell upon Thomas C. Dawson, of long experience as an American diplomat in Latin America, and the study of the financial problem upon Mr. Ernest H. Wands, an expert of much experience in Latin-American affairs. The Government asked also that the currency standard should be lifted from the quicksand of paper which had been issued by all the governments since 1893 and put upon a stable basis. Inevitably the arrangement suggested itself which has been so successful in San Domingo—that a loan should be made by American bankers to the Republic, secured by the direct collection of the customs. Such a loan has been offered by two well-known banking-houses of New York. The total of the loan, if original plans are carried to completion, will be about $15,000,000. Of this amount several millions will go to extinguishing old obligations, both foreign and domestic, about $1,500,000 to the establishment of a bank and the reform of the currency, and the remainder to building railways and developing the rich natural resources of this long-suffering country. Already the amount required for giving stability to the cur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rency has been advanced, and Nicaragua will soon be on an effective gold basis.

At present a single railroad about 115 miles in length runs from Corinto, on the coast, to Grenada, close by the Lake of Nicaragua. The coffee plantations in the higher districts, the gold mines of the East Coast, the rubber forests, the banana plantations, and the great expanses of hard woods are practically untapped by railroad communication or even by good roads. With stable government and a sound currency, foreign capital is likely to flow into Nicaragua in the same manner that it has flowed into Costa Rica under the encouragement of the United Fruit Company and other American and European enterprises. Great is the contrast between economic and social conditions in Costa Rica, with those of Nicaragua, her northern neighbor. In Costa Rica good roads, the improvement of harbors, reasonably adequate banking facilities, the steady employment of labor, the continuous sovereignty of law and order, and the contentment of the people are the fruits of good government and the encouragement of foreign enterprise.

In Nicaragua, after nearly a generation of misgovernment, protection against enemies of peace at home can come only under the advice and support of America. Otherwise, however good a single government may be, it must maintain itself by force, and is likely to be at any moment the victim of a greater force, promising greater rewards in spoliation and dishonest opportunity to its followers. It is the cry of those who love peace, order, and safety for property, liberty, and life which rises loudest for the assistance and support of the United States in maintaining good government. To the great Republic whose power is symbolized by the Stars and Stripes, they utter in effect, the prayer of Horace to Augustus after he had brought peace to the blood-weary Roman world:

"When you are here the ox plods up and down the fields in safety; Ceres and bounteous blessing cheer our farms; our sailors speed o'er seas that know no fear of pirates; credit is unimpaired; no foul adulteries stain the home; punishment follows hard on crime. . . . Each man closes a day of peace on his native hills, trains his vines to the widowed trees, and home returning, light of heart, quaffs his wine and ends the feast with blessings on thee as a god indeed."

CHARLES A. CONANT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NAVAL WAR COLLEGE

BY REAR-ADMIRAL A. T. MAHAN, U.S.N.

In military activities, the question of the utilization of the armed forces is the most critical and the most vital that confronts a nation. It is the final stage of a progress which begins with the drill-ground, where the raw recruit is fashioned into the finished soldier, and with the workshops where crude material is converted into weapons of war. Utilization presupposes all the successive processes of organization and equipment; whereby, step by step, out of individual men are built up huge military units, army and army corps, battle fleet and battle-ship, as individual in their power of intelligent corporate action as is the one man in his single existence. Thus, assuming the foundations upon which action rests, the directing authority dismisses them out of mind, concentrating attention purely upon the problem how best *to use* those entities which organization and equipment have supplied. It is to a similar concentration I would here invite readers, asking them also to dismiss from their minds, as not under consideration, all thought of the material of war, of the antecedent processes by which a national fleet, or national army, is built up; to accept each and both as being ready, with only the one question remaining: how they, or either of them, is *to be used* to the best advantage in war?

The methods by which this result is to be reached are divided naturally under three heads. These, in the order of time sequence, are Movement, Strategy, and Tactics. The first of these comprises not only motion, but all the dispositions for marches and transportation of supplies which make possible the transference of armies over ground, in advance or in retreat. This function of moving armies and their trains has received the technical name, Logistics. Various derivations have been assigned for this term; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one now generally accepted is from a Greek word, the root idea of which is "calculation." It is not necessary to enlarge upon the complications of detail involved in moving huge bodies of men, with their supply-trains, by calculated progress, stage by stage; including each day's march, each day's halt, each day's meals, over roads in any case relatively narrow. All this may be assumed, or left to the imagination. But it should be observed that the special characteristic of this class of operations is Movement, pure and simple. The movement, it is true, is minutely organized in many intricate particulars, and therefore is truly a work of military art; but withal it is not accompanied by those particular directive ideas which in Strategy and Tactics make movement subordinate to action, in which movement is in itself merely contributory. In short, in Logistics movement is the principal; whereas in Strategy and Tactics it is only an agent.

In sea warfare the analogue of Logistics is found, but much simplified in conception by that quality which is the distinguishing characteristic of sea forces — mobility. Mobility facilitates supply, as it does the movement of the fleet itself. The narrow strip of marching surface afforded even by the greatest highways is superseded by the broad bosom of the deep. The ocean presents no natural impediments, few obstacles. Each ship carries stores for weeks; and at night there is no halt, no wait for food-supplies. The vessels move straight on for their goal with unwearied crews. The necessary train of supply-ships, repair-vessels, colliers, all have mobility like to that of the fleet itself. But there remains a counterbalancing factor affecting the question of sea logistics: that of sustained movement and maintenance during a campaign. Fleets more often than not operate remote from home. Consequently, the chief items of supply must traverse long sea distances, under conditions of exposure exceeding the corresponding chain of supplies of an army, which in their approach are secured in large measure by the interposition of the army itself between them and the enemy; a safeguard expressively phrased in the words "covering the communications." In such case land communications may suffer by a raid, unexpectedly and momentarily; but raids by land are restricted in time and space by the imperfect mobility inherent in land conditions, whereas the mobility which is the prerogative of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

water makes sea communications much more liable to successful harassment.

It will be recognized, therefore, that the determining the places of rendezvous for coal and other supplies, the protection of the routes, the whole question of keeping the holds and coal-bunkers full, and the several ships in best steaming condition, is a big administrative calculation and coordination, which is an instance of Logistics because it directly affects the fleet's power of action. Nelson, by diligent watchfulness, always during his last great campaign had his ships stored full for three months; usually for five. That is, the movement of his fleet wherever he would was assured for those periods. Wrote a contemporary to him:

"You have extended the powers of human action. After an unremitting cruise of two long years in the Gulf of Lyons, to have proceeded, *without going into port,* to Alexandria (in Egypt), from Alexandria to the West Indies, from the West Indies back again to Gibraltar; to have kept your ships afloat, your rigging standing, and your crews in health and spirits, is an effort such as never was realized in former times. You have protected us for two long years, and you saved the West Indies by only a few days."

This was an achievement of Logistics, of Movement constant and unimpaired, because of diligent prevision. No fighting; yet it underlay Trafalgar.

Yet it is very different from Trafalgar, which illustrates Tactics; different also from the various movements of the British and hostile fleets in the half-year before Trafalgar, in which there was abundance of motion directed toward specific points and with specific aims, covering both the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. These specific aims are known as Strategy; the movement of ships in furthering them was merely a contributory agent, which resulted in bringing the fleet to the scene of action. In like manner the movement of the ships in the battle was merely contributory, to carry out the tactical conception of the method of attack.

From the outline sketch of Logistics here presented it is evident that it is an immense administrative function, covering many details and requiring much system and prevision, justifying the derivation from "calculation." In management, however, it is somewhat deliberate, and should fall mainly upon men subordinate in office to those who guide the great military conceptions of strategy and tactics. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is dwelt upon first, because, while as vital to military success as daily food is to daily work, yet, like food, it is not the work. In this paper attention is to fasten upon the work. Like organization and equipment, logistics underlies achievement; but while nearer the field of battle than these are, and coincident and contemporary with the action of the field, it yet is not, so to say, on the fighting-line, nor has it to do with the direction of those movements upon which success and victory immediately hinge.

Evidently the management of such a system of movement and supply requires much experience, and also that training or instruction which in most professions precedes experience and facilitates its acquisition. Similarly, training and experience are requisite in the more advanced stages of the art of war: Strategy and Tactics. And it is to be noted closely, as well as clearly, that the object of training and instruction is not merely to mould the individual, but to impress upon each a common type, not of action only, but of the mental and moral processes which determine action; so that within a pretty wide range there will be in a school of officers a certain homogeneousness of intellectual equipment and conviction, which will tend to cause likeness of impulse and of conduct under any set of given conditions. The formation of a similar habit of thought, and of assurance as to the right thing to do under particular circumstances, reinforces strongly the power of co-operation which is the essential factor in military operations. Combination and concentration, two leading ideas and objects in war, both indicate unity of energy produced by the harmonious working together — co-operation — of many parts.

Obviously such harmony is not best when merely mechanical, for machinery is easily deranged in presence of the unexpected. It is the inspiration of common purpose and common understanding, which, when the unexpected occurs, supplies the guiding thought to meet the new conditions and bend them to the common end. If this condition be adequately attained, the mind of the commander-in-chief will be omnipresent throughout his command; the most unexpected circumstances will be dealt with by his subordinates in his spirit as surely as though he were present bodily. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of such a result. The captains of individual battle-ships, the commanders of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the several corps of an army, have it in them to make or to mar the purposes of the commander-in-chief; not by disaffection, but by lack of comprehension. Lord Howe's entire plan of battle in 1794 was thus wrecked, as was Rodney's on an earlier occasion, by incapacity which previous training should have obviated. In land warfare, the twin battles of Gravelotte and St. Privat, in the Franco-German War, gave illustration, one of a subordinate fully comprehending and consequently not only executing his general's full conception, but developing it even further as opportunity arose; whereas the other, by failure to comprehend, effected only confusion and disorder, without result.

It is to supply such common understanding and inspiration that War Colleges have been instituted. Those who receive the training go forth imbued with a common mode of thought, which latterly has received the name of Doctrine. There is about this word a suggestion of pedantry which impels to a justification for the use of it. In military operations Doctrine, if not given the name, has always existed. When Nelson took his first independent command, three months before the battle of the Nile, he summoned his captains frequently on board his own ship, where he explained to them his proposed methods of action under many possible conditions. This was his Doctrine. When the battle came off, each captain understood what he was to do, and what the others were to do; and that not mechanically, but with a general idea applicable to all probable circumstances. "I should never have dared to attack as I did without knowing the men, but I was sure each would find a hole to creep in at." Each captain was possessed with the spirit and understanding of Nelson himself.

In like manner before Trafalgar, the *Nelson touch* of which he spoke exultingly was the Nelson doctrine, imparted to the captains severally and collectively. Collingwood's impatient remark when Nelson made his famous last signal, "I wish Nelson would stop signaling, for we all know what we have to do," is an affirmation of "doctrine" understood. An imperfect comprehension of Rodney's doctrine, by the captain whose ship was the pivot of the operation, lost the admiral what he considered the greatest opportunity of his life. The absence of "doctrine" is shown by his words subsequently:

"I gave public notice that I expected implicit obedience to every signal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made. My eye on them had more dread than the enemy's fire, and they knew it would be fatal. In spite of themselves I taught them to be what they had never been before—officers."

It is to be observed that the eye of the admiral had to be everywhere, just because there was among the officers no spirit of doctrine on which he could rely.

The French word *doctrinaire*, fully adopted into English, gives warning of the danger that attends doctrine; a danger to which all useful conceptions are liable. The danger is that of exaggerating the letter above the spirit; of becoming mechanical instead of discriminating. This danger inheres especially in—indeed, is inseparable from—the attempt to multiply definition and to exaggerate precision; the attempt to make a subordinate a machine working on fixed lines, instead of an intelligent agent, imbued with principles of action, understanding the general character, not only of his own movement, but of the whole operation of which he forms part; capable, therefore, of modifying action correctly to suit circumstances. "When I tell Lord Howe to do anything," wrote his senior, "he never asks how it is to be done, but goes and does it." This illustrates the proper relation of a superior to a subordinate. It is not only generous, but sagacious. Hence, in the instruction of war colleges, great stress is laid upon the formulation of orders; in that particular respect that while they are to convey lucidly to the subordinate the general aim of the operation, and his own specific share, with such collateral factors as are necessary for his understanding of the situation, the guidance is left in his hands. He is to be told what is to be done, not hampered with directions how to do it; because the "how" may not fit a condition he finds before him, but even more because his own power of independent initiative is too valuable a military asset to be so repressed.

A curious illustration of the existence of a doctrine, among seamen not usually suspected of theorizing but considered specifically practical, is found two hundred years ago in the express order of the British Fighting Instructions that an attacking fleet was first to form on a line parallel with the enemy, and then to steer down upon him, all ships together; the van to engage the enemy's van, the center the center, the rear the rear. It was a very bad doctrine; not least bad in that it took all discretion away from every one. The one saving clause—unexpressed—was that a man who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fights will always be approved. Contrast this with Nelson at St. Vincent. It is true he had received no doctrine from his commander-in-chief, but he had the equivalent—he perceived his senior's plan; and, seeing it about to fail, he broke out of the order and thwarted the enemy's attempt. Brilliant as this was in an exceptional man, it is much better that the average man should be equipped with the understanding which would reach the same result through comprehension. Collingwood, a distinguished example of the average man, was on this occasion close behind Nelson, in the order most favorably situated to imitate him; but he had no doctrine by which to overpass the signals.

It seems self-evident that if a doctrine, as described, is to be valid to the ends of a common spirit and to foster individual power of initiative on certain broad common lines, it must be not only a general principle, or set of such principles, but must be assimilated mentally through numerous illustrations. In other words, it must be based on antecedent experience. Formulated principles, however excellent, are by themselves too abstract to sustain convinced allegiance; the reasons for them, as manifested in concrete cases, are an imperative part of the process through which they really enter the mind and possess the will. On this account the study of military history lies at the foundation of all sound military conclusions and practice, and therefore is the basis, the corner-stone, upon which the instruction of a War College rests. Historical occurrences, analyzed and critically studied, have been the curriculum through which great captains have trained their natural capacity for supreme command. They correspond to the legal cases and precedents which embody and illustrate principles, and so govern judicial decision.

It is evident on consideration that military precedents derived from history are chiefly valuable as embodying principles, which are to be elicited and then to be applied in circumstances often very different. They are not mere models for a copyist. Two battles will rarely be fought on the same ground; and were the ground the same, the constitution and numbers of the opposing forces will vary. A leading feature in War College instruction, therefore, necessarily is the constitution of new cases, problems, hypothetical but probable, to the solution of which are to be applied the principles derived from military history. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Applicatory System, as it is fitly called, is thus the superstructure; raised upon the basis of experience as embodied in historical military events. It is to be observed that this system, though artificial, reproduces closely the conditions under which military decisions have to be reached in actual war. Each situation that arises in the course of a campaign is a new case, to which the commander-in-chief applies considerations derived from his own experience, or from his knowledge of history. It is not meant that these applicatory processes in the field are always conscious efforts of memory, although Napoleon has said that on the field of battle the happiest inspiration is often only a recollection. The exercise of the functions of a trained mind is instinctive, as well in such recollection as Napoleon cited as in decisions which seem wholly personal. Said the great Austrian general, the Archduke Charles:

"A general often does not know the circumstances upon which he has to decide until the moment in which it is necessary to proceed at once with the execution of the necessary measures. Then he is forced to judge, to decide, to act, with such rapidity that it is indispensable to have the habit of embracing these three operations in a single glance. But that piercing perception which takes in everything at a glance is given only to him who by deep study has sounded the nature of war; who has, so to speak, identified himself with the science."

This is a tribute to the methodical training of faculties. Such training is the peculiar object of the Applicatory System; to identify the mind and its habit of action with the art of war, by continuous exercise in dealing with numerous varied instances; a process of repetition which cannot but have the effect that habit always has upon conduct and character. The statement of this effect appeals to the experience of every one. All know how inevitably and unconsciously one repeats the same action under similar circumstances—the "second nature" of the proverb. When this result has been produced in a number of men who act together, there will extend throughout the entire command a unity of purpose and of comprehension which to the utmost possible extent will insure co-operation, because it has already insured a common understanding and habit of action. Thus of the renowned Light Brigade of the Peninsular War, formed under the still more renowned Sir John Moore, it is said that "the secret of its efficiency lay in inculcating correct habits of command in the regimental officers."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The system of discipline, of instruction, and of command formed in the persons of their company officers a body of intelligent and zealous assistants, capable of carrying out the plans and *anticipating* the wishes of their seniors; not merely a body of docile subordinates capable of obeying orders in the letter, but untrained to resolute initiative. The most marked characteristics of Sir John Moore's officers were that when left alone they almost invariably did right. They had no hesitation in assuming responsibility. They could handle their regiments and companies, if necessary, as independent units; and they consistently *applied* the great *principle* of mutual support."

A convenient, because recent, instance of an actual case, which might very well have been constituted as suppositive by an instructor, may be found in the circumstances and conditions of the respective military and naval forces of Japan and Russia before their still recent war. The Japanese authorities had before them the positions of the Russian principal army in Manchuria, the fortified port of Port Arthur, the actual or estimated numbers in the field and in the garrison, the Russian main fleet in Port Arthur, the powerful detachment in Vladivostok, the Russian vessels on the way east at various points; probably also the two or three at Chemulpo, the separation of which at a moment evidently critical indicated an incaution which was doubtless responsible for the exposure also of the main fleet to torpedo attack. The various facts here given, with the corresponding elements on the Japanese side, stated in a succinct orderly manner, constitute a problem of exactly the character hypothetically assumed in a War College problem. When stated, the query follows: Estimate the situation; decide your course of action, which is styled technically, the Decision; and for its execution formulate your orders to subordinates. The orders to each subordinate will state clearly the situation, the part assigned to himself, with as much information concerning the movements of others engaged in the general operation as will, or may, enable him to act intelligently. What the subordinate is to accomplish —his mission—is made perfectly clear. How he is to do it is left to his own judgment; partly because the circumstances under which he may have to act can rarely be foreseen, chiefly because reliance can be felt that men brought up with a common vision will do the right thing.

At the War College the propounding such a problem as the one just cited has been preceded by a course of lectures by men whose previous study and experience have con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stituted them experts. Each officer under instruction submits two papers: (1) Estimate of the Situation, deduced from all the factors, at the close of which is formulated a proposed course of action, which is called the Decision; (2) an Order, or set of orders, for putting the decision into execution. The Estimate of the Situation involves, as a factor, a determination of the proper strategic end to be accomplished; the ultimate achievement of which end, whether at once or later, is styled the Mission. Upon this follows consideration of the numbers and disposition of the enemy's forces, and of one's own, as modifying the possibility of immediately accomplishing the Mission. Thus Mission defines the end; Decision, the practicable first step. If objection be taken to terms such as Mission and Decision —as of Doctrine—the reply is that in all technical treatment technical terms are necessary; and that, when once comprehended, they facilitate discussion, exactly as each foreign word acquired facilitates conversation.

For executing the Decision, orders are addressed to each subordinate for his particular part in the combination which the Decision requires. Both estimates and orders are then reviewed by the instructor, with criticism and suggestion. Ultimately there is a general discussion among all in full conference. Besides the elucidation which any matter receives from the deliberation in common of several minds, this discussion reacts upon the men engaged. It tends to correct errors, yes; but the great advantage is that principles and illustrations enter into the mind more and more through repetition, not only in the particular discussion of the varied phases of a single case, but by reiteration in many discussions of many cases. For a principle, if correct, cannot but recur repeatedly, steadily deepening its grip.

The value of such a study as that suggested above for the Japanese is still more recognizable, if we imagine it undertaken by the Russian staff a year before the war began. This will illustrate the vital connection between national policy and military preparation. Upon this the War College strongly insists, and most properly has embodied in its course. International policies is one of the subjects of study. In the United States people are singularly oblivious of the close relation between peace and preparation. Outside of a few officials of the Navy Department,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public opinion about naval development does not take into its reckoning any digested consideration of our international exposure. Granting that the Russian officials kept such account as they should of Japanese military and naval preparation, they would have had in hand a year before the war the following data: The size, constitution, and disposition of the Japanese army; the numbers and character of the Japanese fleet; the means of transportation available to Japan. As matters of serious dispute existed, these data constituted elements in the problem: How to follow the national policy and yet maintain peace? The Japanese maritime transportation was a large part of the logistics of Japan, as the Siberian Railroad was of that of Russia. The data mentioned, together with the numbers and disposition of the Russian fleets and armies, formed the elements of a problem; to be formulated by a clear and succinct statement of each and all of the factors named. The same demand follows: Estimate the situation; formulate your measures to assure peace or to encounter war (which in such a case are identical); and issue the orders necessary to execute the measures. If the estimate of the situation had been undertaken by officers with a national doctrine, the Decision must have been to strengthen the fleet in the Far East; not by vessels proceeding singly—as was done—but by a division as strong as the Baltic ports could send. An estimate of the situation could not but have shown that, although the Russian navy in the aggregate was superior, the division in the Far East was not as strong as, for security, it should be. The whole navy had been divided injudiciously; the first requisite—Decision—was to reunite it by measures strategically sound, which the despatch of a string of single ships proceeding out was not. The strong naval conviction prevailing in the United States against dividing our battle fleet between the Atlantic and the Pacific was derived from the War Games of the College, testing the strategic situations resulting from such division.

The War Game, which has been used for many years at the War College, attacks the same class of problems as does the written "estimate of the situation" and formulation of measures just described. In it the men who write the "estimates," etc., are pitted one against the other, as opponents. Similar data are furnished to each: a statement of the conditions as far as known to his superiors—namely, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disposition of the forces on his side, and such account of the enemy's as may be reasonably assumed to be ascertained, but necessarily less full than that of one's own. Each receives also, as from a national government, general instructions, indicating the particular service expected of his command. This is his "Mission": *what* is to be done, not *how* to do it. The place of a chess or backgammon board is taken by a large map embracing the scene of operations, upon which are arranged and moved tokens representing the positions held by both sides, as well as the numbers and successive dispositions of the various forces. The game thence proceeds, move by move. The two contestants occupy separate rooms, while in a third is an umpire who pronounces on each move; whether, by the experiences of war, it is feasible, and so permissible. Within a certain range he decides by his own judgment and accumulated experience; while in other cases there are fixed rules and fixed values assigned to different forces and to different situations. Doubtful cases are under certain conditions submitted to the decision of the dice; thus recognizing Nelson's saying that some allowance must be made for chance, and Napoleon's that war cannot be made without running risks. The game as described embraces all the operations of a campaign, from the start from home to the collision of the fleets. It thus opens with strategy, which embraces the whole field; narrows gradually till the fleets feel each other's proximity, and are, as it were, manœuvering for advantage on the field, a phase called stratego-tactical; finally, there are the sighting each other and the manœuvers of battle, technically styled tactical. In these last, on the game-board, the rules governing "values" are based entirely on the scheme of battle exercises of the battle fleet in April, 1911; a circumstance illustrating the interconnection between fleet and college, which it may be hoped will be continually greater.

If a nation possesses military positions abroad, many cases in war, and many hypothetical cases at a War College, will present situations which involve both land and sea forces. This added condition constitutes a more intricate problem; but the method of dealing with it, whether by written estimates and subsequent discussion, or by war game, is the same. Owing to more numerous data, the condition is more complex; but the manner of solution will be like.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It will also readily occur that in every War College—and many nations now possess them—the scenes chosen for hypothetical cases to be discussed and solved will be primarily the regions in which general national policies, or particular international relations, make military or naval operations most probable. Historical incidents, *wherever* occurring, are profitable for instruction, for the elucidation or confirmation of the great universal principles of military action; but, for application of those principles, the scenes first to be selected are those where the national forces are most likely to act.

The treatment, purposely discursive because intended to be popular, has made mention of Logistics, Strategy, Tactics, and National Policies, giving at greater or less length the character of the subjects thus named, their relation to the purpose of the Naval War College, and the method of treatment; emphasizing the great object of evolving a common mode of thought, and appreciation of proper military conduct, among all the officers of a navy. There remains one other subject, International Law. In a country full of lawyers and politicians, with a government possessing a President, Secretary of State, and a large corps of ambassadors and foreign ministers, it may be asked doubtfully why naval officers should give time to international law. The reply is that in this extensive system of functionaries the naval admiral or captain is incidentally one; and that, in international law, as in strategy and tactics, he must know the doctrine of his country. In emergencies, not infrequent, he has to act for his superior, without orders, in the spirit and manner his superior would desire. If in war, the war may be complicated by a dangerous foreign dispute arising from action involving neutral rights; or, on the other hand, a neutral unright may be tolerated to the disadvantage of the national cause. In peace, injudicious action may precipitate hostilities; or injudicious inaction may permit infringement of American rights, of persons or of property. The treatment of international law, consequently, is the same as of the more distinctively military subjects —a competent lecturer and lecture system, the posing of problems, their solution by the student, comment and criticism by the teacher, discussion in full conference.

A. T. Mahan.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECENT RUSSIAN FICTION:

A CONVERSATION

BY W. D. H. AND T. S. P.

W. D. H.: What is the name of that newest and greatest Russian writer whom you were talking to me about last summer?

T. S. P.: Artsibashef.

W. D. H.: You feel that he represents the great thing in modern Russian fiction?

T. S. P.: In my opinion, yes. People object to him a good deal, and very naturally, but it seems to me that what he does well he does better than any one.

W. D. H.: Does he do it comparably to Turgenief or Tolstoy?

T. S. P.: He is not to be compared with them in any way; he is entirely different.

W. D. H.: Is he a voluminous person like Tolstoy?

T. S. P.: Not very; two or three volumes of stories and one published novel and one novel he is writing now.

W. D. H.: Is he a condensed person like Turgenief?

T. S. P.: He is not at all like him; he is more like Maupassant.

W. D. H.: Has he gone to French sources for his form and his literary ideal?

T. S. P.: He writes somewhat like Maupassant and I should think he has probably studied him; I know he is not like any one else.

W. D. H.: What I was trying to do was to orient myself in regard to the man. At the time eighteen or twenty years ago when we were beginning to read the Russians and about the Russians, and were very much concerned in them, the only criticism I found was in what Melchoir de Voguë had written and what Dupuy had written, but people must have written a lot more.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

T. S. P.: They all said very much the same thing.

W. D. H.: You don't think there has been very much of importance said since, about the great Russian school that revealed itself to us then?

T. S. P.: No, I don't think there is much. I think a very good exposition is found in Prince Kropotkin's book about Russian literature.

W. D. H.: I suppose you began first—I did—with Turgenief.

T. S. P.: Yes.

W. D. H.: You translated the one we liked very much: *Dmitri Rudine*. Did you translate that from the French or from the German?

T. S. P.: I translated that from the French. I think probably the German editions, the Mitau editions, had not begun then.

W. D. H.: Of course my next experience after Turgenief was all Tolstoy. And it began through you. Years before I was calling on Professor and Mrs. G—— in Cambridge and *War and Peace* in a French version was lying on their table. They said, "There is a curious book," and they seemed a little bewildered by it, but they were such intelligent people that they could not help valuing it; they said it was a great book, but they spoke mostly about its physical vastness. Then, years later, when you came to me with *Anna Karenina* you said: "Here is something which I would like you to read. It is the old French business of the seventh commandment, but it is not treated at all as the French novelists treat it." I think you left it with me and I must have read it first in French.

T. S. P.: Yes. The English translations appeared later.

W. D. H.: Then of course that led backward and it led forward among Russian authors for me. I don't know whether we talked much of Gogol or not at that time.

T. S. P.: Well, we did. I remember I went out to see you when you were living in B—— and I was reading the *Dead Souls* in German, I think. I don't think there was any French translation then of that. And certainly no English one.

W. D. H.: I think I read *Dead Souls* first in French, and then afterward we had a very good English translation of it—I dare say by Nathan Haskell Dole. And that we read aloud together in my family, and we were immensely amused

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with it; but before that somehow I had got hold of *Tarass Boulba,* which I read.

T. S. P.: That is, in French.

W. D. H.: That must have been in French. I am not sure whether I read it in French or in English. (Curious how one doesn't remember!) Then I understood from those critical authorities that there had been a great change in Gogol's literary heart; that he had turned over from what was evidently rather a romantic tendency in *Tarass Boulba* to the extreme realism of *Dead Souls.*

T. S. P.: Oh yes, he did, undoubtedly.

W. D. H.: Well, I had gone back to him—and next, it seems to me, I went forward to Dostoyevsky. I think it was you who spoke to me first about *Crime and Punishment.*

T. S. P.: I think very likely; I was very much interested in it.

W. D. H.: I read it and I was tremendously stirred with it, and I said to myself, "I will read everything that man has written." I have never succeeded in reading anything more! Is that your experience?

T. S. P.: Yes. My Russian teachers have all wanted me to read some other things of his, but I haven't yet done it and I think I shall evade them the rest of my life.

W. D. H.: Well, now among the new men is there anybody like Turgenief?

T. S. P.: No, there is nobody just like him.

W. D. H.: There is nobody like Turgenief, as he was like Pushkin?

T. S. P.: No, there is not. But there are very good men in their way; a very different way. There are several good ones. There is Tchekof.

W. D. H.: I was going to speak of Tchekof.

T. S. P.: His short stories are very good and his plays are better still. I prefer his plays to his stories; his plays are very fine. They are different from other modern plays inasmuch as they seem not to be constructed, not built up, but are like peeps into a house. Of course to get that effect one has to contrive very carefully, but the contrivance is not shown; you see no architecture. It seems, as you read it, ineffectual and leading to nothing; people showing their qualities in little scraps of conversation. It seems most incoherent, but when you have read the thing you find it hangs together beautifully.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. D. H.: Of course nobody was a more careful structurist than Ibsen, but it does not show in Ibsen; does it show less in Tchekof?

T. S. P.: I don't know Ibsen really well enough to compare them. I know that I like Tchekof's plays very much.

W. D. H.: Well, has anybody come forward from Gogol in the sort of humorous realism of *Dead Souls?*

T. S. P.: No, I don't think there is any such humorist. There is a gleam of humorous perception in Tchekof, but the whole country of Russia is so black with unhappiness that humor does not seem to abound there. Tchekof has what would be humor under other circumstances, but it does not show as humor in his work.

W. D. H.: But besides Tchekof is there no humor in anybody?

T. S. P.: I have never found any. Tchekof has a little humor in some of his plays, but such a weak and gentle trickle of it that would hardly do for a play at a country fair. His real strength goes into thunder-storms, and gloom, and terror, and things of that sort.

W. D. H.: Then Gogol is about the only humorist that you know of amongst the Russians.

T. S. P.: Yes, just about.

W. D. H.: What was the *Revisor*—his play that was so much talked of?

T. S. P.: You don't know that?

W. D. H.: Never have read it.

T. S. P.: It is almost the best play that was ever written. The scene lies in a little provincial town where news is brought that the government inspector has come; the man does not declare his intention of inspecting, but they know he must be the government inspector because they have had word he was coming from Petersburg. The governor, the mayor of the town, are in a great state of excitement and all the officials; and the mayor invites him to his house and they all offer to lend him money. The man is really a young student who has lost his money gambling; he is very much surprised at the attention that is paid to him, but is quite master of the situation. He takes money from them all; the graft that has been going on is exposed, in their toadying and his receiving, and he finally gets off with his pockets full of rubles. Then the messenger comes in and says to them, "The inspector has just arrived." You

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

know the story about the play, how the Emperor Nicholas gave Gogol permission to write it. It is always being acted.

W. D. H.: In the most modern phase of Russian literature is there anything poetical?

T. S. P.: I have Nekrasoff's poetry; one of my Russian friends sent it to me and asked me to read it, but it has hung fire. I have left it in the country, and next summer, if the season is dry and long enough and tedious enough, I may read some of that, but I am not eager to get at it.

W. D. H.: Are there any other poets?

T. S. P.: There must be. Yes, there are. I don't know much about them.

W. D. H.: Then there is nobody apparently a successor to Gogol, or in his line, you say.

T. S. P.: No, there is no one.

W. D. H.: I read a Russian story once called *The Cruel City* by a writer who called himself Korolenko, which I understand is a pseudonym. That had some humor and lightness in it, although it was dismal enough in places. Could you say they have anything like light fiction at all?

T. S. P.: Yes, I had one novel sent to me the other day. I could not read it, it was so light. I can find the like in every language. There were the little incidents; I was sure it was going to end happily. But I did not learn Russian to read that kind of thing. Just so I had a Russian temperance novel sent me; but I can read temperance novels in English. What little I have read has only been what seemed most intensely Russian. That is what I am trying to get at; to get the flavor of that.

W. D. H.: Yes, of course. And this new man you told me of. I forget his name.

T. S. P.: Artsibashef.

W. D. H.: Oh yes—Artsibashef. There isn't much "lift" in *him,* is there?

T. S. P.: No; but he is delightfully agonizing.

W. D. H.: Those passages from the story you read me last summer were certainly agonizing.

T. S. P.: Yes. They were from a story called *On the White Snow.* (Reads:)

"Liodvic Anderson the teacher came out into the school garden and determined to walk to the grove which looked like lace lying on the white snow about two versts from the village. The day was light and fresh. The wet, dark stalks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the plants stood out against the snow, the air was light and clear as it is only in very early spring.

"'One more spring in my life!' thought Anderson, with a sigh, for he was a little inclined to sentimentality, and, gazing through his glasses, he laid his hands behind his back, twirled his walking-stick, and stepped forward. At that moment he saw in the road at the end of the garden a number of people and horses.

"They were soldiers. Their dark uniforms stood out against the white snow, their guns sparkled, and one could see from a distance how the horses crept clumsily along in the snow. For a moment Anderson could not make out what they were doing, but suddenly he felt and saw they were doing something strange and terrible, and instinctively it flashed through him that he ought to hide so as not to be seen by them. So hastily, with his hands still clasped behind him, Anderson turned to one side, fell on his knees in the soft, wet snow behind a pile of last year's straw and weeds. From there, by stretching his neck a little, he could see what the soldiers were doing.

"They were about twenty in number, and among them one officer, a young man, on horseback in a gray uniform with silver trimmings. His face was so ruddy that even from a distance Anderson could see the clear outline of his blond mustache and eyebrows. He said something and his clear voice reached Anderson's ears without difficulty.

"'I know what I have to do,' he shouted, with his hand on his hip and gazing at some one below him in the band of foot soldiers. 'I will show you how to riot — accursed rascals!'

"A great terror seized Anderson's heart. 'My God, is it possible?' flashed into his mind and his blood ran cold.

"'Captain,' some one answered very quietly from among the soldiers in a restrained voice, 'you have no right. There is a court for these matters—'

"'Silence!' shouted the officer, waving his white glove, and one heard his rage in his voice. 'I will give you a court, Ivanof. Go ahead!'

"He touched his rein and turned to one side. Liodvic Anderson noticed mechanically how the horse moved gingerly and mincingly, with ears erect, stepping as if it were dancing. At that moment there was a little stir among the soldiers and they fell apart, leaving an empty place, and there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stood three men, two tall, the other short and round. Anderson saw his white head and his prominent red mustache.

"He understood what it all meant and what he was about to see, but this was so unexpected and so terrible that he thought he was dreaming.

"'It's so pleasant and beautiful—the snow, the fields, the sky, the spring air—and they are going to kill these people; it's impossible!' This flashed through his head and seemed to produce that dizzy confusion which seizes a man when he sees, hears, and feels something different from what he is accustomed to.

"The three men in black stood in a row by the fence, two were together, the other a little apart.

"'Captain,' said one of them, Anderson could not make out which, 'God sees us.' Eight soldiers hastily dismounted with clatter of swords and spurs. They were nervous, as if they were planning some thievish action. There was silence for a second while the soldiers arranged themselves in a line before the men in black and raised their guns. One of them knocked off his cap, which fell in the snow. He picked it up and put it on white with snow. The officer's horse still danced in the same place with its ears pricked up, and the other horses, raising their ears and turning their long, wise heads, gazed quietly at the men in black.

"Suddenly there was a deafening roar that sent Anderson trembling. He distinctly, and at the same time with agony, as in a dream, saw the black figures fall, the pale flash spring from the guns, and the light smoke rising in the clear air, and noticed how the mounted soldiers, without looking at the men who were killed, hurried away along the sloppy path with their sabers rattling and spurring on their steeds. All these things he saw from the middle of the path without knowing when or why he had come out from corpse, his face was covered with a light sweat, he trembled behind the heap of straw. Liodvic Anderson was as a and tottered in a most complete despair. The feeling was something like nausea, only fainter and more terrible.

"When the soldiers had disappeared beyond the grove people began to gather at the scene of the execution, although before no one had been visible. The men who had been shot lay behind the hedge on the edge of the road where the snow had not been trampled on and was still

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clean and white. There were three of them—two grown men and a young man with light hair, who lay in the snow, seeming to be supported by his long, thin neck. The face of the next one was not to be seen because he had fallen forward into a pool of blood; the third, a large, black-haired man, lay stretched out at full length and his arms outspread in the blood-stained snow. The day was bright and clear. The white snow, the wet, dark branches of the hedge, the red spots in the snow, and the motionless black figures stood out in sharp contrast; the air was clear and transparent as it is only in early spring. The cluster of trees that stood near showed swelling buds.

"The men who had been shot lay motionless, black in the white snow, and from a little way off it was impossible to understand what was so terrible in their calm at the edge of the narrow road.

"That night Liodvic Anderson went to his little room in the school-house; he did not write any poetry as he usually did, but he stood by the window and, gazing at the pale, distant moon in the blue, half-cloudy sky, thought. His thoughts were gloomy and depressed, as if a cloud lay upon his brain. From the window in the vague moonlight he could dimly see the black silhouettes of the hedge, of the trees, of the pale garden, and it seemed to Liodvic Anderson that he saw also the three murdered men, two full grown and one youth. They were lying there now on the side of the road near the empty, silent field, and, as if alive, their dead, pale eyes were staring at the cold, distant moon. 'A time will come,' bitterly thought Liodvic Anderson, 'when it will be impossible for one man to kill another. A time will come when these soldiers and this officer will understand what they have done and will understand that that for which they killed these three men was as necessary, as important, as precious for these same soldiers and officers as for their victims—'

"'Yes,' he repeated, with an air of triumph and with streaming eyes, 'that time will come. They will understand.'

"And the pale circle of the moon grew blurred and confused in his eyes. There seized him a great pity for the three men who were slain, whose eyes gazed silently and sadly at the moon without seeing it, and mingled with that pity was a feeling of bitter hatred.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"But Liodvic Anderson calmed himself and muttered, quietly, 'They know not what they do,' and from that old familiar sentence he drew strength to overcome his rage and grief.'"*

W. D. H.: Agonizing—agonizing, I should say still.

T. S. P.: Unfortunately many of his novels cannot be recommended to every one, but they are extremely powerful. In this one I am just reading, which is in course of publication, he describes the death of an old man, an old professor, who feels his mind leaving him and himself sinking away in a most harrowing way; but it is really beautifully done. As a work of art it is astounding. Then he describes the life of a frivolous young fellow with equal skill; and they are contrasted one with the other in a most vivid way. And he does it with no exaggeration.

W. D. H.: No. That the Russians seem incapable of.

T. S. P.: He has absolute calm and his style is so moderate. He uses so few adjectives, but they are immensely impressive. There is a modern Russian school that uses adjectives in a way to drive the student to despair. All the adjectives that are and are not in the dictionary they use, but they don't produce half the effect of this man with "cool, bright, dark, gentle, hard"—just the ordinary adjectives of daily use; but they count more than thunderstorms.

W. D. H.: Of course if there is not a profusion of them they do count. Gorky: does this new man derive from him or follow after him or anything of that kind?

T. S. P.: I should doubt it. This new man writes something like Gorky; Gorky has the same bitter strength that this man has, but I don't think Artsibashef descends from him; I think he would have appeared whether Gorky had written or not.

W. D. H.: From what you read to me of this man last summer I should not think he *intends* to be bitter.

T. S. P.: No, not a bit.

W. D. H.: He does not intend to embitter you? He simply gives the facts?

T. S. P.: He simply records. There is a singular absence of animus in him. He is like the man who has the panorama go by and sits at the front and explains it. He did not

* The version here given is the revision of the translation originally made *viva voce* from the Russian text.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paint the panorama. It passes before him and his voice tells you what it is. That is all. He has no desire to make the world better or worse. He represents the man who thinks the only thing to do is to kill yourself; he represents the perfectly frivolous young man; he represents the man who wants a revolution, but he is impartial with them all. He is like the cinematograph.

W. D. H.: That came into my mind.

T. S. P.: You cannot tell his own feeling about things. His critics say he is like some German philosopher; one man having said it, they all repeat it.

W. D. H.: I suppose really if he is very much of an artist he has not much philosophy.

T. S. P.: I don't think he has any.

W. D. H.: It is his business to see and record?

T. S. P.: Yes, and what he sees is so tremendous that his record makes a great impression.

W. D. H.: Yes. Now, there was something in our talk in the old days that always interested me very much, and that was your notion that the simplicity of the Russians was possible through their want of a literary past. You still feel that?

T. S. P.: Perfectly.

W. D. H.: That is interesting, I think.

T. S. P.: Most interesting. They never had any Renaissance; they simply grew up. I feel that all the time in comparing the French translation of *War and Peace* with the original. Tolstoy writes in a perfectly simple way, the way one would write a letter to one's aunt with no literary phrasing at all; his style is quite awkward at times.

W. D. H.: Yes?

T. S. P.: Almost crude at moments. In the French there would be those old and faded flowers of rhetoric brought in. Where he said he did not like a certain thing at all the French would say the thing "seemed repugnant to him."

W. D. H.: I know it; that is their tradition; that is their convention; they must do it that way.

T. S. P.: They must do it that way. And in Russia there was no time when one learned that way of saying things.

W. D. H.: Then this new man, Artsibashef, does he write like Tolstoy?

T. S. P.: No, he writes like Maupassant.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. D. H.: Maupassant is as simple as a Frenchman can be.

T. S. P.: Artsibashef does not have flowers of rhetoric; he describes with almost absolute nakedness, but utmost simplicity. There are other men who have those flowers. I have read some stories in the many-adjective movement where they were. This man has none of them.

W. D. H.: Well, then, what about the material of Artsibashef?

T. S. P.: Entirely the present condition of Russia.

W. D. H.: Does he permit himself, or is he permitted, to write about political and social matters?

T. S. P.: He always has trouble with the censor.

W. D. H.: What I fancy is that in Russia a man could not permit himself, or would not be permitted, to write down just what he sees.

T. S. P.: He would always be liable to get into trouble.

W. D. H.: Even if he wrote it without color of personal feeling?

T. S. P.: Of course. Yes, with the police given the power that they have. A great deal would depend on the state of the nerves of the censor when he examined the manuscript, and if he was annoyed with the young people in it he would easily find something to object to, but I am surprised at the number of things you find there that get by the censor. In some of Artsibashef's stories he describes most vividly the state of mind in the agitators—such as one who is deputed to kill a governor. On the whole, yes, I am more surprised at the things that pass the censor; I don't know how many things do not pass, but the censor allows a very frequent description of indecencies and murders and assassinations and things of that sort. But what Artsibashef seems to me to do is to describe people as he knows them or thinks they are. He wrote a novel called *Sanini,* I think in 1905. It came out in 1908, and during that time there had been a great change in the mood of the students, and people thought that he was describing the result of the change, whereas he had written it before the change; it was apparently the way he thought the change was going, and they seemed to think because he described this result that it was his ideal of what ought to be. It was not his ideal at all, any more than it was his ideal, when he describes a murder, that people should commit murder.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course that is the fantastic and mistaken notion which the outsider always has—the notion that a man describes what he wants and not what he sees.

W. D. H.: As to the material of these books, of course it is what he sees. But the events, are they related sometimes to what we call morality or immorality—the sexual phase?

T. S. P.: You mean the incidents?

W. D. H.: Yes.

T. S. P.: In describing the lives of the students, I mean the men and women, of course questions of morality come up.

W. D. H.: And he is frank about the facts?

T. S. P.: Absolutely. He is the frankest man that ever lived. He does not use such material to make his novels alluring; it simply comes in as part of the day's work. At least, it is so where he is least offensive. At times, however, he carries his frankness to an impossible degree; he passes all limits, and it is for this that the critics have very justly blamed him. His manner is not pornographic, but the matter is. This is a great pity; the man is a master of his art, he is sincerely moved by all the pathetic futility of life, and in a few lines he sets the scene before you. The trouble is with the scenes he is willing to set before you. He is indignant with his critics for condemning them, but the critics, too, are compelled to tell the truth.

W. D. H.: You remember when Tolstoy's death of Ivan Illyitch turned all cultivated readers pale?

T. S. P.: I do.

W. D. H.: There is simply the story of a man who is putting up a picture and twists himself and gets something out of order in his interior and he begins to die. Of course the great importance of that book was his feeling about death; and not so much his anxiety in regard to any life hereafter as his remorse for the vacuity and futility of his life here in the past. Is there anything of that sort, of spiritual feeling—

T. S. P.: Artsibashef is full of it.

W. D. H.: Then I should like to read him.

T. S. P.: You would like to read him. I am always feeling that I am admiring him too much, but I cannot read him without immense interest. He is always describing the death of some one and doing it so wonderfully.

W. D. H.: He personalizes it to you, makes it yourself?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

T. S. P.: Absolutely. No one ever wrote with greater power.

W. D. H.: Then there is another thing in the Russians that has interested me, and that is following a character into the Valley of the Shadow of Death; Turgenief does it and Tolstoy does it; Turgenief does it once, Tolstoy does it twice; once in *The Scenes of the Siege of Sebastopol* and once in the *Death of Prince Andrew;* and Turgenief does it in *The Virgin Soul* where Neshdanof shoots himself. Does Artsibashef do anything of that sort?

T. S. P.: Yes. In this last novel the conclusion is universal carnage. The few who escape a lingering death, lovingly recounted by the author, are obliged to resort to suicide. All the fashionable methods of self-murder are described by an expert. No such general slaughter has been seen in fiction since Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy.* We find his heroes dandling the idea of killing themselves, setting it in every light, regarding it as the only proper solution of every question, and then accomplishing it. As a mere matter of literary art he overdoes it here most lamentably.

W. D. H.: Then there is something else in Tolstoy which he does two or three times, but chiefly in a sketch called "Master and Man," where the master and the man are lost together in a snow-drift. The superior has always felt his superiority, but when it comes to their dying, their freezing together, he recognizes their essential unity as two human creatures and feels that they are one and the same. Does Artsibashef do anything of that sort?

T. S. P.: That does not enter so far as I have seen. No, Tolstoy always has a moral background; and this man has not, in the sense that we understand it, at all.

W. D. H.: He gives the thing and lets the application take care of itself?

T. S. P.: Exactly.

W. D. H.: Tolstoy cannot do that.

T. S. P.: No, he cannot because Tolstoy is so interested in saving the soul of the world; and this man is not. When an old fellow dies in this novel he crawls out of bed and he is on his knees and prays; the man had never felt the slightest interest in that sort of thing before, but nothing is made of it; it is never announced that that is a better thing to do. It is merely this old man happened to do it.

W. D. H.: Well, is there anything in the new Russian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

literature like what one is obliged to call our localism—that is, are the Russians more homogeneous than we are?

T. S. P.: Oh, so far as I know they are, because the same civilization is thinly spread over the whole country.

W. D. H.: That is what I was thinking of, so far as we have done anything worth while, it is in each man or woman studying his own little corner of the country and getting at its difference; then the difference is something of which you can be conscious and you value it. But in Russia I fancy that the conditions are almost universally the same?

T. S. P.: I fancy they are. That would be the impression made upon me by their literature.

W. D. H.: In the town there would be everywhere the artisan and the employer, and in the country the peasant and the landlord.

T. S. P.: Yes, nothing else. That would be my impression. I think there is this about Russia to be said, that the young men there often have nothing to do; a great many who are not obliged to occupy themselves have no interest; they don't go, as they do here, into business that takes all the bright young fellows off; they are left free to indulge in the only thing they can indulge in, and that is writing. So the best go into literature, and there is a vast crowd of people beginning to write there, and then the good ones go ahead. You have read Andréef's stories? A number of them have appeared in the American magazines. Some are very good, but they always seem to me overwrought, violently overwrought, as if out of disturbed nerves; so they don't interest me as much as those that are more what I am pleased to call better done, more artistically done. But he is a very important man.

W. D. H.: Then there isn't that spiritual yearning of Tolstoy's, the longing to be good, in the newer men?

T. S. P.: No.

W. D. H.: Is it because they have given it all up?

T. S. P.: They have given it up in despair. The fact is the country doesn't know what to do now. It is like a boat which has lost its sails and its rudder; the people are floating about and moving this way and that, not knowing at all how to go anywhere or to get anything. When the progressives had their ideal of educating the people and at once becoming very powerful, then they were comparatively hopeful; but of course when they tried that they very soon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

failed, and now they don't know what to do. They have all sorts of fantastic notions which a man like Artsibashef exposes to you, but none of them can do anything.

W. D. H.: Well, this terrible reaction from the hopeful conditions of 1906, when the revolution seemed to be going forward there and not going backward at all—is there anything of that sort reflected in Artsibashef?

T. S. P.: Yes, a great deal—the uncertainty.

W. D. H.: He recognizes that? And the suspense?

T. S. P.: And the suspense. In fact, a revolution that consists in blowing up and pillaging does not lead anywhere; all that seems foolish and monstrous; and now the Russians are marking time, they are drifting. Of course one cannot be a prophet, but the situation is not so inspiring to their novelists.

W. D. H.: Artsibashef is not a Jew?

T. S. P.: No, he isn't. A short sketch of his life is given in the German translation of his works. He is of Tartar descent, though with admixture of Russian, French, Georgian, and Polish blood. One of his ancestors was the famous Polish hero Kosciusko. He was born in 1878 and intended to become an artist; but he was too poor to buy paints and canvas and was forced to support himself by drawing caricatures. He wrote a story which he managed to get printed, and then his true vocation showed itself to him; he became a writer.

W. D. H.: What occurred to me was to ask whether the Jew in the new Russian literature, as we may call it, has done anything analogous to what Artsibashef has done.

T. S. P.: No, I fancy not, because the condition of the Jew in Russia—he would scarcely live there.

W. D. H.: I did not know but there was some Jew articulate enough to talk about the conditions.

T. S. P.: I don't think so. The Jew doesn't get into the literary movement at all. That is my opinion.

W. D. H.: I asked you about the recent Russian plays and I think you spoke of them. There are no humorists, you think. And the morality of Tolstoy, we have touched upon that. As far as the modern novelists have plots, do they deal with the seventh commandment and the same tiresome old things?

T. S. P.: I dare say some do; they deal with all the commandments impartially.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. D. H.: They don't make the seventh their job as the French do?

T. S. P.: Oh no, not at all.

W. D. H.: Now, then, there is that curious thing which always struck me in the Russian novelists—the horror of death. We are all afraid to die, but they seem peculiarly afraid to die, though they don't mind being killed.

T. S. P.: Well, as I said, Artsibashef is always writing about that. It comes into many of his novels and he writes some of his best things about it.

W. D. H.: Well, are there any French or German or English translations of the new school?

T. S. P.: There are some German translations of Artsibashef; no French.

W. D. H.: And no English, of course.

T. S. P.: No English that I have seen.

W. D. H.: Are there any criticisms or studies of the new school in Russian?

T. S. P.: Yes, there is one by Serge Persky in French on the contemporary Russian novel; it is a very good book; it came out the other day. He translates Russian novels and tales into French and he has written some little things of his own, but this study is his best work.

W. D. H.: Then, for vastness and profundity and exaltation and all that, you have to go to *War and Peace* still?

T. S. P.: That is still the greatest; but I should say there are no books written between that and the *Iliad* to compare with either. There never will be for another thousand years another such book.

W. D. H.: I don't see why or how there should be.

T. S. P.: Exactly. But it seems to me that the Russian literature in fiction is still somewhat more interesting than that of a good many other countries. The French literature, the French novels, French stories, one has a more or less definite idea of, and the German—well, not *all* the German stories and novels are interesting, and not all the English ones, and not all the American ones. The Russians have, I think, a greater individuality, a greater charm, a greater vividness than the rest.

W. D. H.: So that if tolerably intelligent young men, as we were once tolerably intelligent and young, came to them now they would take the same interest in them we did twenty years ago?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

T. S. P.: That I don't know, but I certainly take a great interest in them.

W. D. H.: I still think of *Dmitri Rudine* as one of the most interesting books I ever read.

T. S. P.: Very admirable—wonderful.

W. D. H.: I wonder if that period with the Russians has passed as well as that way of picturing it?

T. S. P.: Yes, I think it has.

W. D. H.: For instance, I don't suppose there is that sort of empty expectation and yearning that you find in Rudine.

T. S. P.: No, but I fancy the sort of man Rudine was, the sort of limp talker, still exists. The Russians are great at talking. It seems to the outsider as if when two Russians got together it was a question which should tell the other most—give him all his opinions on every subject under heaven; they are very fond of exposing their views to each other, as Dmitri Rudine did.

W. D. H.: Yes, I know; but I don't think they are autobiographers, as we are. They don't want to talk about themselves so much as about what they think.

T. S. P.: Yes, what they think. They are full of interest in what they think; most amusing. They all are in the novels, and at first I thought it was a literary device.

W. D. H.: No, it is not. It is what is going on in their minds.

T. S. P.: It is the only way you can make them lifelike.

W. D. H.: Does Artsibashef use the inward, the interior, drama as much as Tolstoy does?

T. S. P.: No.

W. D. H.: Half the drama in Tolstoy is what goes on in the man's brain.

T. S. P.: He is not at all like Tolstoy. He has a certain amount of interior drama. For instance, in this novel which I'm reading there is an officer who is universally hated and is a selfish pig; but his heart is touched once, and for the first time in his life he receives some joy from being kind. It comes upon him suddenly.

W. D. H.: That is interesting.

T. S. P.: Yes, it is really most agreeable; and in that way the internal drama is played; the man has a new view of life and a new sensation.

W. D. H.: That is quite Russian! In Artsibashef or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in any of the moderns are there any new girl types like Natasha's in *War and Peace?*

T. S. P.: No, not so charming. There are some interesting ones.

W. D. H.: Is there any love-making or much love-making in his books?

T. S. P.: Not generally; not of a very exalted kind. No, you don't see charming creatures like that girl.

W. D. H.: Have you read *Hilda Lessways?*

T. S. P.: No, I have not read that.

W. D. H.: Well, there is a very important type in that girl with her wild, irresistible desire to experience, to know everything that is going on, and to be part of it. She is perfectly comfortable; she lives with her mother, but she wants to go out into the world and be as a man among men, yet still in a perfectly innocent way; and she goes and learns short-hand writing; she makes herself useful on a wretched little local newspaper that some faker starts; and she wants to follow life all through, not in a nasty way, but to know all the world that men know.

T. S. P.: Artsibashef describes some of the girls going into the revolutionary business very well.

W. D. H.: Is he allowed to do that?

T. S. P.: Yes. One of them is going to throw a bomb and fails to do it at the last moment because of the feeling of despair that comes over her—admirably done! That is in one of his short stories.

W. D. H.: So far as there is love-making, is it on our terms or does it depend upon the class they are in?

T. S. P.: They meet, oh yes, with the utmost freedom, but he is very awkward in that matter. In his shorter stories he describes children very well; and there is a sketch of a poor old blundering station-master in some out-of-the-way place where he hears there is going to be trouble in the capital, and he feels that they must have a little demonstration where he is with no notion of why or wherefore or what. He goes out and stops a train and then the soldiers come down and put him up against the wall and shoot him.

W. D. H.: From all, then, it appears to me that the present literary condition in Russia is not comparable in esthetic importance to that of Turgenief's time.

T. S. P.: No. Because Turgenief's was the culmination of a period of writing in which there had already been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some very good men—for instance, Pushkin, Lermontof, and Gogol. This man is the beginning of a new era, and the beginning is always crude and disturbed; something is yet to come out of it; the best is yet to come out of it. This is anything but a period of calm, and Turgenief wrote in a period of calm, of depression, depressed unhappy calm.

W. D. H.: Are there any women writing?

T. S. P.: There are some. None that I have read. In fact, that temperance novel was written by a woman and that trivial novel was written by a woman, but I could not read them.

W. D. H.: From what you say I understand the new Russians in number and amount of production are rather few.

T. S. P.: Well, there are a number like Kuprin. I don't care much for them. Kuprin is the most important.

W. D. H.: The Germans are still not in it with the Russians?

T. S. P.: In my opinion they are not in it.

W. D. H.: There seems to be a sort of suspense of faith in the French, too, doesn't there?

T. S. P.: Yes, I think so.

W. D. H.: The English have come forward lately. I think Merrick and Arnold Bennett and Phillpotts and Galsworthy are all doing good work.

T. S. P.: Yes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN A MONASTERY

BY LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX

PLACE: The Certosa di Pavìa
TIME: 1517

HERE in this quiet corner of the earth
I sit, wrapped round in peace and brooding thought;
Daily ere sunset tips our glistening spires
I walk along the cloister flags and count
The slender shafts of rose and white, whereon
Our four-and-twenty cells look out; the sky
Is caught and framed in each three-pointed arch,
And from each niche a stalwart saint looks up.

I sought this place myself; safety I sought
From a tumultuous life; no Joseph, I,
And yet my master's wife plucked at my robe.
'Tis like the tale I oft see wrought in stone
High up upon the great Cathedral walls.
I cannot strive; I only cared for peace
And prayer and meditation and still days.
The hours are dull and I forget to think
The saintly meditations, I had planned,
And fancied that they nested in these walls.
Alas! I was unknowing; the bell that tolls
To prayer breaks in on sad and sullen thought
In which I ask, and ask, and ask again,
"Why am I here?" Then beat such promptings off
With paternosters many times retold.
But best I like to stand there in the cell
Where Mary, painted by Luini, sits,
So patient resting with her child and book,
And gazes, slantwise smiling at the Christ.
She knows the weary watch for looming fate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Nine months," her weary smile says, "aye, nine months
I bore the intolerable thought of some event
In which the angels took a part; and all my dreams
Were awed by strangeness, till my little babe,
All human, came to draw me back to earth.
Then following through the quiet days I learned
How little of our life we know to live.
And so I followed Him; from the warm straw
On which He smiling lay, a tiny babe
With curls and pink-soled feet, like other babes,
Until I heard Him on His cross forgive
Mankind; and then I saw Him smile at them;
He smiled and said, 'They know not what they do.'
And hearing this I knew Him for my God.
I saw a far, far off horizon light,
And knew that different, better days would come
And different men; till then we bear and wait."
So says Luini's Virgin on the wall.
Sebastian and Christopher, His saints,
Say just the same, "We do not know our fate."
And so with bowing heads and waving hands
They face the still hours with their mystic smiles.
Saint Christopher, the one who smiles so still,
Forded the stream by night and bore the Child
Through waves tumultuous that rose and curved,
Mountainous crests that broke above his head;
And all the while, the Babe, light-girdled, sat
Upon his shoulders, two small fingers raised,
To bless; yet heavier and heavier bore him down.
I have no burden, God, not even a grief;
Only long days that cut me off from joy.
Sometimes when slow the sun turns red and droops,
One sanguinary ray will pierce my cell
And fall upon this vellum page I write;
I look and then I have my mood of joy,
Elation for the thing that I have wrought
In slow, sad hours; the careful curves and lines,
Long scrolls and delicate gay tendril work.
O God, just this! And all the rest is thirst
And hunger and the body's needs! That leap
Of heart I do despise, with which I hear
The bell that tolls me in to eat; I am
No glutton like Tomaso there; 'tis not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The love of food and drink and less the love
Of jest and laughter. Rather 'tis I joy
To break the sad, slow time in which I stare
At these white walls and wonder how it is
E'en beauty wanes. Sometimes across my thought
A long-lost memory wakes me to my past;—
My mother as she kissed me in my bed—
That neighbor's child I took a-nutting,
How she laughed! I hear it through the dark
When wide awake I toss and think at night.
She may be dead by now; out in the world
I might have wept above her bier and felt
Real grief to know her laughter stilled forever.
Once ere my life was shut in these close walls
I traveled on a mission with a priest.
He taught the people all along the way.
He preached and gave them images of saints,
Which they confounded with their ancient gods
And prayed to in a blind, profane, dull way.
And then they grieved that neither saints nor gods
Stretched down their hands from heaven's blue to save
Us from our deeds and follies and mistakes.
Yet while we went, we came to that sweet point
That juts into a sapphire lake; there once
A Roman singer, fighter, built his home.
So bold the strip of land stands, feet in sea,
Backed by the silvery olive-groves, with stems
Wherethrough the sun peeps, making broken shade
Over the dry, brown grass. Out at the end
The storied arches rise; all that is left
Of grandeur past there at Sirmione,
Built some one thousand years ago. And there
The arches curve for God's own works,
To sapphire lakes and mountain peaks and towns,
That huddle in the hollows of the land,
And dabble in the shallows of the sea.
I thought to be a singer too and priest.
Not less but more than he who built his house
On beauty of the land and sea, because
I built my thoughts on God. Alas! Alas!
I did not know how bleak the night through which
One treads to God and to His starry heights.
What deeds are here to fill these empty hours?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The memory lives; I can recall at will
The moment and the light, the soft, low swish
Of waters that recede. And oft at dawn
Some slant red ray that falls across my bed
Awakes the dream. But most I live my life
Just at the moment's instance. Crave my food
And hate my brother's face and nasal whine;
Or ache until my very soul is sick
To 'scape these walls grown hideous by sameness.
Sometimes I watch aerial squadrons spread
In shifting patterns on the autumn sky,
And all my heart grows sick to fly like birds
To other scenes and other thoughts and lives.
The pang is like to burst my breast. I turn
Back to the golden page I make to save
My soul. For who can say but that long hence
Some traveler from some unknown shore may bend
Above my pages, gold and brown, deep blue
With silver letters, each a picture drawn,
For its own beauty; see my margin broad
With angels, harps, and saints set there for joy.
And, too, that he may know that traveler,
Coming from din and traffic of much life,
How here in silence and the dark I yearned
For life and width and brightness, I have set
In small medallions by the letters large
Soft Lombard scenes; gray waters, willows bent
By wandering winds. And even once I drew
A castellated tower with ladies fair
Who sat and watched while knights came riding by.
I've heard a sailor once from Genovà
Braved all the dangers of the unknown seas
To find new lands. He found them barbarous,
Waste, bare, and savage. Nay, I would not spend
A life in braving dangers wild, and go
Sailing the monstrous seas that swallow lives
In sheer wild lust of cruelty and death.
But if I had a life to give, I'd tread
The flowered earth and see all lovely towns
Our painters set behind the Blessed Child,
Those backgrounds to immortal motherhood.
I'd climb the dim, blue hills that all are crowned
With towers white and battlements. I'd find

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Inlets of soft, smooth sea and winding roads
Down which great kings with all their motley troops
Come riding in high state and pageantry.
I'd watch the broidered garment of the Spring
Shaken out loose across the land and sea,
The fringèd trees take on new pride, and earth
Grow green and glad beneath the brightening sun.
I'd travel far to see the homes that man
Has reared to make his earth look safe and gay.
I'd toy o'er courtly words in splendid halls
With ladies in stiff brocade gowns that shine
As do our abbot's jewels 'neath the light
O' th' altar on fête-days. It cannot be!
Yet I have had my hours and have them still.
Here at this desk where lies my parchment scroll
On which I limn gold lines and arabesques,
And soft medallioned pictures to make fair
The text—the westering sun sends rays of gold
That fall between the window-bars athwart
My book and light it up until the page
Of letters seems alive and I can think
The work I've wrought in still, sad musing hours
Shall yet outstrip me; live when I am dead,
And speak to other men of all this mystery,
This secret of the immortal life of art.
Who draws a perfect scroll or limns a page
Leaves treasure here for other men and speaks
Beyond his day; controls his fate and reaps
Reward for empty hours and starved desires.
And so I set my heart on him who'll come
From far, long hence to see my page and stoop
And say: "Would God I'd made a page like that!"
And so for this I throw my life and soul
Into the balance to be weighed and tried
With this the work I've done. God! I have wrought
Some beauty in my day! It is enough!

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ACQUAINTANCE WITH YUAN SHI KAI

BY HORACE N. ALLEN, LATE U. S. MINISTER TO KOREA

For ages past the shibboleth of aspiring reformers in the Middle Kingdom has been "China for Chinese"—ruled as they were by conquering races from beyond the border. This is the cry to-day. The alien Manchu rulers have been dethroned and a Chinese ruler, a Chinaman of the military class, Yuan Shi Kai, has been installed under the title of President of the Republic.

He is one of the few Chinese officials of exalted rank who has seen foreign service and experienced the broadening of vision that comes from contact with the outside world. True, this foreign service was had in Korea, a country that furnished one of the dynasties of China, and was later claimed by China as one of her so-called vassal States; but this service was gained by him at a time when Korea was enjoying foreign relations as a sovereign State, with a court at which Western Powers had their representatives; and as one of Yuan's chief functions in Korea was to maintain the then attenuated figment of Chinese suzerainty, he had ample opportunity to test his powers and match his ability against this Western element.

A military protégé of the great Li Hung Chang, Yuan was sent to Korea just before the difficulties of 1884, when Chinese troops and Korean allies succeeded in killing off or driving out the Japanese in the bloody *émeute* of December of that year, when the few surviving Japanese refugees were given asylum at the American Legation, and the new Japanese Legation was consumed by flames, and all vestiges of Japanese residence were sought to be destroyed.

This repulse was the cause of Japan's recent rise to her present place in the front rank of the world's military

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers, for it convinced her of the necessity of trying effectually conclusions with China as to the latter's claim to the overlordship of Korea. The success of these conclusions in the war of 1894 and the bungling result, ending in the assassination of Korea's Queen, threw that unhappy people under Russian influence and made necessary the Russo-Japan war of 1904.

Having by his arrogance induced or made possible the war of 1894, which led as a direct result to the one of 1904, Yuan may therefore be said to have early made himself an important factor in the destinies of Japan and China, as well as Korea.

The writer was present in Korea in an important capacity during all the period of twenty-one years covered by these three conflicts, when China defeated Japan in 1884, only to be herself defeated and driven from Korea in 1894, which event was so greatly eclipsed by Japan's defeat of Russia in 1904-5. The decade of Yuan's residence in Korea he enjoyed more or less intimate relations with him and it is proposed to narrate briefly a few of the chief events in which the latter figured, since they throw some light upon the character of China's present hope as seen during that important epoch of the foreign education of Yuan Shi Kai.

I was called upon to give surgical assistance to the wounded soldiers of Yuan's troops as well as to the wounded natives. There were no wounded Japanese to care for. Aside from the little handful of refugees at the American Legation, all the Japanese in Seoul at that time were either killed or driven out. Later I was medical officer to Yuan and his Legation, which intimate relation was followed by a bitter contest with him, when, as an officer of the Korean Government, I succeeded in establishing a Korean Legation at Washington in the face of Yuan's strenuous efforts to prevent any such violation of China's claim to sovereignty. His attempts had the support of a Chinese fleet of six ships, as well as the cordial co-operation of the Chinese Legation at Washington. Still later, as the representative of the United States in Korea, Yuan was a colleague, and showed his good qualities as a fighter by no open admission of ill feeling because of his failure to prevent the establishment of Korea's first Legation abroad, which so effectually punctured the claims of his government to control the foreign relations of Korea as a vassal State.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

My first real intimacy with Yuan began with a daylight breakfast at his camp, where I had spent the whole night in giving surgical relief to his wounded. Hunger had a new meaning that cold December dawn, and coffee and bacon seemed the most delectable things to be thought of; in fact, the thought of them was insistent and compelling, and the call to "eat food" was obeyed with alacrity.

What was my chagrin, however, on seeing the table set with but six bowls of rice, three at each of the two places, and no prospect of anything further. It seemed that I could devour the whole six and still keep on thinking of coffee and bacon.

Before I had finished one bowl I was uncomfortably full and still hungry. Yuan had in the mean time, with his bowl to his lips and his chop-sticks keeping a steady stream into his mouth, emptied his three bowls, and, seeing that I could eat no more, he took my portion and soon finished it. If it is true that "an army moves on its stomach," Yuan should be a good soldier.

Yuan did not impress me as an unkind man; in fact, I later saw evidences, in matters too intimate for narration, to indicate quite the contrary. Yet when he refused me permission to amputate the arm of one of his soldiers with the amused remark, "Of what good would a one-armed soldier be?" he seemed cruel, especially as I assured him that otherwise the man would die in three days—as he did. Still, in the case of a horribly mutilated soldier, half of whose neck was torn away by a Japanese saw-toothed sword-bayonet, after recovery he took the helpless man on as a supernumerary or pensioner at his Legation. In the case of the other man he seemed only to see the practical side of the case from his own military standpoint, and the personal factor doubtless counted for little, in view of the vast masses to be drawn upon for military service.

From commanding the Chinese troops in Korea, Yuan succeeded to the post of Chinese representative to that land. He had found in Seoul one of the most intelligent of the Chinese students returned from America, Tang Shiao Yui, who was connected with the newly established maritime customs organized as a branch of the Chinese service under Sir Robert Hart. There were several of these students then in this service in Korea; for, as they found an air of suspicion and distrust surrounding them in their home land

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after their foreign education, they were quite willing to accept this near-by semi-foreign service. Being of a wealthy Southern family and unusually intelligent, Tang seemed to impress Yuan favorably, and he took him into his own service. The two have remained almost inseparable ever since, until the recent temporary deflection of Tang, who espoused the cause of the revolutionists when sent at Yuan's instigation, as a commissioner, to treat with the revolutionists at Shanghai. Now that Yuan has himself accepted the headship of the revolutionary party, it may be concluded that, as usual, Tang's advice has prevailed with his "chief."

Yuan has shown marked skill in his choice of associates and assistants and in binding them to himself in the strongest bonds of loyalty, as in the case of Tang Shiao Yui, who was in Washington on a diplomatic mission when Yuan's enemies succeeded in compassing, as they seemed to suppose, his downfall after the death of his patroness, the late Empress Dowager. Tang left at once for Peking, in spite of engagements in America, and his presence doubtless had much to do in saving Yuan's life and making possible his present advancement.

Yuan has shown loyalty to his friends in return for their support, even to the extent of seeming to be disloyal to the late figurehead Emperor in his greater loyalty to his patroness the Dowager Empress. In this he showed his ability to carry out the policy of his great benefactor, Li Hung Chang. Moreover, the position of the ex-American students was made vastly better with his rise, and they were given an opportunity to devote their intelligence to the service of their government, some of them attaining high office; for, in addition to being picked men to begin with, they had had the great advantage over other native officials of a long residence and education abroad.

When Yuan succeeded on the death of his patron, Li Hung Chang, to be Viceroy of Chihli, Tang became Taotai, or Governor, of the important Northern commercial city of Tientsin, and he kept on rising with Yuan's rise, being at times Ambassador, Viceroy, and what we would style Secretary of State.

But this relates to the after part of Yuan's life following his ten years of education in Korea, and did not come under the personal view of the writer. But it illustrates what seems to be Yuan's ability to choose able and loyal asso-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciates and to heed their counsels. If this proves to be a fixed trait with him, it is one of the best auguries for his success in his new field of tremendous responsibility.

The *émeute* of 1884 in Korea resulted in the Li-Ito convention of Tientsin in 1885, by which each of the contracting powers covenanted not to land troops in Korea without first notifying the other, and providing for the withdrawal of the Chinese garrison then in Korea.

Being thus shorn of his military powers, Yuan was made Chinese representative at Seoul, and he was apparently given unlimited powers by Li Hung Chang, to whom seemed to fall the control of Korean matters from the Chinese side. Yuan had the power of life and death over his nationals, for one thing. I have seen Chinamen beheaded by his executioners on the street at the side of his Legation, in full view of the passing populace, for violation of his regulation against gambling.

He took to himself the title of Resident in imitation of the British representative in India. This made the other representatives appear as though accredited to a vassal State, and was probably what his chief desired. England had not at that time discovered the new Japan, and by winking at these playful antics of her then protégé—China—she made it all the more difficult for the other powers, especially as she " saved her face " by, at that time, styling her representative a Consul-General, while America and Japan had Ministers, and Russia a Chargé d'Affaires. Naturally Yuan's pretensions bore most heavily upon Japan, who bided her time while allowing him to climb still higher that he might have farther to fall.

His arrogance knew no bounds. He would not attend any of the diplomatic meetings with the other representatives, and when it became absolutely necessary for him to attend some Korean State banquet he would have himself placed as *vis-à-vis* of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, so that the table would have two heads.

When we went to an audience at the Palace, Yuan would have his reception placed at an earlier hour, so he would be coming away as we approached. Moreover, as it was quite a half-mile from the gate of the Palace inclosure to the audience-hall, with no pavements, and as no one but the ruler was allowed to ride in his sedan through the Palace grounds, and as Yuan insisted upon enjoying this royal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prerogative, we would invariably be obliged to stand aside, in the mud at times, as he rode smilingly past the discomfited "vassal envoys," with his great retinue of overbearing retainers.

It was amusing to overhear the *sotto voce* remarks of the Japanese on these occasions, and they certainly demonstrated thus their ability to bide their time. About the first thing they did of note after the landing of troops in 1894 was to drive a coach and pair over this sacred way through the Palace inclosure.

True, a number of us young chargés d'affaires did rebel once when our chiefs were absent. We flatly refused to attend a most important ceremonial audience unless permitted to ride in our chairs. Being on intimate terms with the ruling family, I knew that we were entirely safe in making this demand, since the Korean ruler disliked Yuan's presumption as much as any one, and, being humiliated by this conduct, he wished to minimize the effect as much as possible and grant us the same privilege he was obliged to accord to Yuan.

The latter's influence was too great, however, and, finding he could not grant us the same courtesy without experiencing some dire results at the hands of Yuan, he compelled the sudden erection of a carpeted hall covering the entire distance from the gate to the audience-chamber. Our departmental secretaries were doubtless amused if they took the trouble to read the despatches covering the event.

But Yuan's arrogance during this decade in Korea—1884-94—was not alone displayed in such personal indignities to his colleagues. As nothing happened to give him any intimation of the pending reckoning, his contempt for Japan extended to an utter disregard of solemn conventions. In spite of an existing agreement between Japan and Korea covering the construction of a line of telegraph to connect Japan and Seoul, under which convention a cable had already been laid between Japan and Fusan, he had a Chinese land line erected in 1886 between Seoul and Fusan.

When in 1893-4 the Tonghak rebellion broke out in Korea and threatened to menace Seoul itself, Yuan was appealed to by the Premier to assist in its suppression. We were led to infer that this Korean appeal was instigated from Japanese sources, but, be that as it may, it became known later that the Japanese Secretary of Legation was using his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unofficial influence in encouraging Yuan in the latter's inclination to intervene in the domestic troubles in the land over which he seemed to think that he was the real ruler. Yuan fell into the cleverly laid trap.

Utterly ignoring the solemn provisions of the treaty of peace of 1885, known as the Li-Ito Convention of Tientsin, he summoned Chinese troops to Korea to suppress the rebellion without previously referring his intention to Tokio. This gave Japan the opening she had been so carefully providing for and leading up to during the ten years since Yuan's troops had driven the little Japanese garrison from Seoul.

I chanced to be in attendance at an official dinner given at the Chinese Legation on the evening when telegrams were received announcing the sailing of Chinese troops for Korea. The jubilation of the Japanese was so evident that gloom seemed at once to rest most heavily upon our Chinese hosts, as a realizing sense was forced upon them of what the step might mean, and the dinner at once broke up, while we departed from the last function given by Yuan in Korea.

Events followed swift and sharp. On June 8, 1894, two thousand Chinese troops landed at Asan anchorage, near Chemulpo. The Japanese were apparently all ready, and promptly accepted this challenge of the Chinese in the open violation of the treaty of 1885, and set about the task for which no one seemed to have any idea they were so entirely and adequately prepared.

China, on the contrary, was most woefully unprepared for the results of the act she had thus blundered into, and no one knew this better than did the Japanese. Japanese secret-service agents in Chinese garb had been fully investigating all China's condition and resources, so that Japan actually knew more of the exact state of her enemy's affairs than did China herself.

Two days after the landing of Chinese troops—namely, on June 10th—five hundred Japanese marines disembarked at Chemulpo, and marched to Seoul to occupy the capital. On June 13th one thousand regular troops arrived from Japan, and eight hundred marched to Seoul and relieved the marines, leaving a force of two hundred at the port—Chemulpo. These were followed by five thousand troops on the 24th of June, and on the 28th the Japanese Minister drove into the Palace and demanded a declaration from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Korean throne on the subject of the Chinese claim to sovereignty. July 18th, fifteen thousand Japanese troops with three thousand laborers arrived, and on the 23d they took and occupied the Korean Palace and the surrounding hills and approaches. On July 25th, the Japanese cruiser *Yashina* sunk, off Asan anchorage, the British ship *Kowshing,* chartered as a transport and loaded with Chinese reinforcements, and this was followed by the decisive victory of the Japanese in the land battle near Asan on July 28th-29th. Japan had effectually exploded China's claim to sovereignty over Korea even before the actual declaration of war on August 1, 1894.

In the mean time Yuan had "seen a great light." His arrogance was all gone, and he went from Korea so rapidly as to leave his women-folk behind to the mercies of those to whom he had been so haughty.

Thus ended Yuan's career in Korea. His arrogance had well served the Japanese, who allowed him to climb high that his ignominious fall might have the greater effect upon the Koreans, whom he had so long bluffed, browbeaten, and even maltreated.

This was the sort of education China's present ruler acquired in foreign service. He could not well have had a more enlightening experience, and that it was administered at the hands of the lately despised Japanese made it all the more effective. The results are seen in his later conduct. His great chief, whom he succeeded, had to go to Shimmoseki to treat for peace with the Japanese, where he was shot and came near losing his life at the hands of a demented Japanese.

Seeing what Japan could do by adopting modern methods, Yuan set about accomplishing the same results for China by similar methods. Though his rise in power to the post of successor to Li Hung Chang, whom he also succeeded as favorite and guardian of the late Empress Dowager, and foremost of Chinese officials as distinguished from the Manchus, enabled him to do much in the way of organizing an army, and protecting foreigners in the Boxer uprising, as well as safeguarding China's interests at the time of the Russo-Japan war, even he could not go as far in all probability as he would have desired in instituting reforms, because of the powerful inertia of Chinese officialdom as represented by both Manchu rulers and native lords.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the death of the Empress Dowager his enemies prevailed against him, and, though his life was spared, he went into retirement, only to be recalled most abjectly by the Manchu rulers to help them save their throne from the present revolutionary party. Loyalty has been shown to be one of Yuan's chief characteristics, and, judging from the press notices, he was loyal to the throne in the extremity just experienced, and only advocated or consented to abdication when that seemed to be inevitable. As has been said before, the quicker mind of Tang doubtless greatly influenced Yuan in bringing him gradually to recognize the revolutionists, of whose government he is now the head.

The situation needs a powerful, masterful man, of intense conviction and strenuous energy. Yuan has presumably but a half-hearted interest in the present movement, even if it has carried him to heights of which he could never even have dreamed in his most arrogant days in Korea, and his former energy has been sapped by his mode of life. He will doubtless give place to some one more fully equal to the occasion if outside influences do not supervene to the more or less dismemberment of that great empire which has so often and for so long felt the yoke of foreign control.

Yet as a native Chinese military official of the highest rank, he is unique in having had actual experience abroad, which has shattered that proud contempt of the ordinary Chinese or Manchu official for all things beyond their own borders, and he will at least be able to appreciate the grave dangers that await his land from outside intervention because of the internal turmoil.

If tranquil times supervene, Yuan should be as good a head as China can at once secure. He is loyal, open to conviction, astute in his selection of associates and advisers, and has a foreign education that has opened his mind to progress along modern lines and the danger that lies in weakness, disorder, and unpreparedness.

If he becomes the permanent head of that vast nation, he will owe any measure of success, as he owes his present rise, to his ten years of tutelage in that little peninsular corner of the Asian continent where he made us walk in the mud for his own aggrandizement—and we shall be amply compensated.

HORACE N. ALLEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS OF SAMUEL F. B. MORSE—1812

BY EDWARD L. MORSE

II

The impassioned appeal of young Morse to his parents and family had no effect whatever. On the contrary, they ridiculed him for indulging in such heroics; they maintained that they were in a much better position to judge of the rights and the wrongs of the matter, and they again insisted on his leaving politics out of his letters. His sympathies were, however, so strongly enlisted on behalf of his beloved country that he could not resist the temptation again and again to give a free rein to his political feelings, while at the same time filling many pages with details of his artistic advancement and of the many wonderful sights which the London of those stirring days afforded.

He returned to the attack in a letter of January 1, 1813:

"Last Thursday week I received a very polite invitation from Henry Thornton, Esq., to dine with him, which I accepted. I had no introduction to him, but, hearing that your son was in the country, he found me out, and has shown me every attention. He is a very pleasant, sensible man, but his character is too well known to you to need any eulogium from me.

"At his table was a son of Mr. Stephen, the author of the odious Orders in Council. Mr. Thornton asked me at table if I thought that, if the Orders in Council had been repealed a month or two sooner, it would not have prevented the war. I told him I thought it would, at which he was much pleased, and turning to Mr. Stephen he said: 'Do you hear that, Mr. Stephen? I always told you so.'

"Last Wednesday I dined at Mr. Wilberforce's. I was extremely pleased with him. At his house I met Mr. Thornton and Mr. Grant, members of Parliament. In the course of conversation they introduced America, and Mr. Wilber-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

force regretted the war extremely; he said it was like two of the same family quarreling, that he thought it a judgment on this country for their wickedness, and that they had been justly punished for their arrogance and insolence at sea, as well as the Americans for their vaunting on land.

"As Mr. Thornton was going he invited me to spend a day or two at his seat at Clapham, a few miles out of town. I accordingly went and was very civilly treated. The reserve, which I mentioned in a former letter, was evident, however, here, and I felt a degree of embarrassment arising from it which I never felt in America. The second day I was a little more at my ease. . . .

"In the course of the day I asked Mr. Thornton what were the objects that the English Government had in view when they laid the Orders in Council. He told me in direct terms, '*The universal monopoly of commerce*'; that they had long desired an excuse for such measures as the Orders in Council; and that the French decrees were exactly what they wished, and the opportunity was seized with avidity the moment it was offered. They knew that the Orders in Council bore hard upon the Americans, but that they considered that as merely '*incidental.*'

"To this I replied, if such was the case as he represented it, what blame could be attached to the American Government for declaring war. He said that it was urged that America ought to have considered the circumstances of the case, and that Great Britain was fighting for the liberties of the world; that America was in a great degree interested in the decision of the contest, and that she ought to be content to suffer a little.

"I told him that England had no right whatsoever to infringe on the *neutrality* of America, or to expect because she, England, supposed herself to have justice on her side in the contest with France, that of course the Americans should think the same. The moment America declared this opinion her neutrality ceased. 'Besides,' said I, 'how can they have the face to make such a declaration when you just now said that their object was universal monopoly and they longed for an excuse to adopt measures to that end?' I told him that it showed that all the noise about England's fighting for the liberties of mankind proved to be but a thirst, a selfish desire for universal monopoly.

"This, he said, seemed to be the case; he could not deny

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it. He was going on to observe something respecting the French decrees when we were interrupted, and I have not been able again to resume the conversation. . . .

"You say in your last letters, 'Were you here, you would be as warm a Federalist as you ever were.' Had I never visited England I probably should, for then I should never have known, perhaps, the truths which I now know. . . .

"When I hear such principles avowed by this government as I have mentioned; when such a contemptuous disregard of American rights is manifested in their measures; when, after our declaration of war, they neglect to answer it for six or seven months, and then in so unsatisfactory a manner as to give general disgust; and when I find no one, in short, attempting a justification of themselves, what must I think, what must any man think, in such a case? Would you have me, in the face of all this, retain my Federal feelings and justify them through everything when they cannot and dare not do it themselves?

"To sum up my sentiments, then, in a few words: I believe that, in declaring war, America has acted justly; that had she done otherwise she would have been justly entitled to the epithets so liberally *(before the war)* bestowed upon her of *cowardly, imbecile,* and the like; that the American administration was imprudent, to say the least, in not having prepared before for such an event. I think that the American character has risen beyond the bounds of the most exaggerated expectation since the declaration of war. We are raised from 'mere descendants of convicts' to a level with a nation who pride themselves as the first in the world, and by whom? Not only by all the powers on the Continent (I have seen extracts from Italian, Dutch, and Swedish papers which speak in raptures of the rising greatness of America on account of her naval successes), but by England herself. As proof of this I could quote passages from every paper in the country. It would certainly amuse you to see the difference in the tone of the public prints from what they were before the war. They were filled with abuse of America, and I have quoted in my other letter instances. How do they speak of her now, with sneers and contemptuous insinuations? No; with the greatest respect; they now for the first time claim relationship with us and speak of us as deserving an equal standing with themselves.

"But I must abruptly close, as I am to send this directly.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

You will have heard before this arrives of the glorious news from Russia. Bonaparte is for once *defeated* and will probably never again recover from it."

Here the son and his parents could meet on a common ground, for they were in perfect harmony in hoping for the success of England and her allies in the campaign against Napoleon Bonaparte on the Continent.

Morse must have tried to obey his parents' injunction to leave politics alone, at least to the extent of not writing about them, for there is no mention of them in his letters of that period until some months afterward, when the temptation seems to have been too great to resist. However, in a letter to a friend of May 30, 1813, he refers to the subject in the following language:

"Your good sister, Mrs. Jarvis, in her letter mentions the marriage of your sister Ann to Captain Hull of the navy. True, it is 'none but the brave deserve the fair.' Captain Hull is a man I had often heard of before the war, and I esteemed him and respected him for the gentlemanly character which he always bore; but since the war I almost adore him and have often been on the point of sitting down to express my feelings of admiration to him in a letter, though wholly unacquainted with him personally. To me in particular he has been the object of triumph to many an insolent Englishman who before the war took pleasure in wounding my feelings by reflections upon the paltry navy of my country. It is now my turn to triumph, and, though I regret this unhappy war, yet I shall ever reflect with pride upon the occasion which has brought before the world a Hull, a Decatur, a Jones, a Bainbridge, and a Lawrence.

"Hull was the first who struck the flag of English invincibility and nailed it to the American mast; to Hull, then, are due the first honors America can bestow."

We find, from a letter of July 10, 1813, to his parents, that his feelings got the better of his discretion:

"I have just heard of the unfortunate capture of the *Chesapeake*. Is our infant Hercules to be strangled at its birth? Where is the spirit of former times which kindled in the hearts of the Bostonians? Will they still be unmoved, or must they learn from more bitter experience that Britain is not for peace and that the only way to secure it is to join heart and hand in a vigorous prosecution of the war? It is not time now to think of party; the country is in danger,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but I hope to hear soon that the honor of our navy is retrieved. The brave Captain Lawrence will never, I am sure, be forgotten. His career of glory has been short but brilliant.

"All is rejoicing here, illuminations and fireworks and *feux de joie,* for the capture of the *Chesapeake* and a victory in Spain. Imagine yourself, if possible, in my situation in an enemy's country and hearing songs of triumph and exultation on the misfortunes of my countrymen; and this, too, on the Fourth of July. A less ardent spirit than mine might perhaps tolerate it, but I cannot. I do long to be at home, to be in the navy and teach these insolent Englishmen how to respect us. I never was treated with such rudeness and such insolence as since this unfortunate affair. They are the first to accuse the Americans of vain boasting, and are the loudest and most unreasonable in practising it themselves. . . .

"The Marquis Wellington has achieved a great victory in Spain and bids fair to drive the French out very soon. At this I rejoice, as ought every man who abhors tyranny and loves liberty. I wish the British success against everything but *my country.* I often say with Cowper, 'England, with all thy faults I love thee still.' But England has faults and great ones, too, which I cannot gloss over. I am ready to allow her all she deserves, but never for a few virtues will I cease to censure her many vices.

"*August 10th, 1813.*—I begin to be ashamed of my native State and of the Federal party. Mr. Quincy's resolutions have excited the abhorrence which is their due from every American here. One sentiment pervades the whole: they all think it a very impolitic and unjust measure, especially at this time. Let me ask, is it the fault of our gallant naval heroes that this war is declared? If it were, it would alter the case; but after they have done so much and have raised the American name to a higher standing than ever it was before; when they have done their duty, no matter whether in a just or unjust cause (they are not the persons to decide), does it become the Massachusetts legislature to pass such resolutions? It is not the way to make naval officers.

"Massachusetts boasts how much she has always been in favor of a navy, and the first time that navy distinguishes itself they not only do not praise the officers of that navy for making it the wonder of the world, but actually disap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prove of their conduct by silence. The Democrats have always opposed a navy, and the Federalists of Massachusetts have now given the finishing blow to it. This is not the way they make naval officers in England.

"*August 26th, 1813.*—Papa says in his letter, among other things, 'The honor of our country ought in no degree to suffer by those disgraceful defeats in Canada.' People here do not take the trouble to inquire whether it is the strongest and most efficient part of the Union that is defeated or not. They know nothing of the Federal or Democratic parties; they think of the Americans; they defeat the Americans in Canada, and the whole American people suffer in consequence.

"Mama has amused me very much in her letters where she writes on politics. She says, next to changing one's religion, she would dislike a man for changing his politics. Mama is, perhaps, not aware that she in this way would shut the door completely to conviction in anything. It would imply that, because a man is educated in error, he must forever live in error. I know exactly how Mama feels; she thinks, as I did when at home, that it was impossible for the Federalists to be in the wrong; but, as all men are fallible, I think they may stand a chance of being wrong as well as any other class of people.

"I do not, in saying this, wish to be thought a Democrat; I execrate their character as much as ever I did; their policy will be the ruin of our country; I think them weak. All this as a party, still I think the majority of the Democrats, as well as Federalists, mean well; they think neither of French nor English influence; they are Americans. But I never can believe that one party can do nothing bad and the other nothing good. The measures of the embargo, non-intercourse, and war I consider as just measures against this country, for reasons which I have before stated.

"Mama thinks my *error* arises from wrong information. I will ask Mama which of us is the most likely to get at the truth, I, who am in England and can see and hear all their motives for acting as they have done; or Mama, who gets her information from the Federal papers, second hand, with numerous additions and improvements made to answer party purposes, distorted and misrepresented?

"But to give you an instance: in the Massachusetts re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monstrance they attribute the repeal of the Orders in Council to the kind disposition of the English Government and a wish on their part to do justice, whereas it is notorious in this country that they repealed them on account of the injury it was doing themselves, and they took America into consideration about as much as they did the inhabitants of Kamchatka. The conditional repeal of the Berlin and Milan decrees was a back door for them, and they availed themselves of it to sneak out at it. This necessity, this act of dire necessity, the Federal papers cry up as evincing a most forbearing spirit toward us and really astonish the English themselves, who never dreamt that it could be twisted in that way."

Writing on March 1, 1814, he says:

"I find you have completely mistaken my opinions of politics. Because I have completely divested myself of party, therefore I must be a Democrat. This, I think, is very unfair that I cannot differ at all from Federalists, but with one jump you set me down on the other side. . . .

"At present I see no reason to change my opinion. I am not Federalist enough to wish for the disgrace of my country, nor Democrat enough to wish the destruction of England, but I am just American enough to wish for a speedy and honorable restoration of peace between us and Great Britain. Thus endeth politics."

He was, no doubt, sincere in resolving to obey his parents and not mention politics again in his letters; but in this very same letter, although evidently at a later date, he returns again to the charge, stung by some remarks in letters from his brothers:

"If I am prohibited from writing or thinking of politics, I hope my brothers will not be so ungenerous as to give me any. Everything is interesting from home which is of a pleasant nature, but they certainly cannot suppose that a black catalogue of all the disgraces which we have suffered since the commencement of the war, with numerous alterations and additions, being a third or fourth edition of the continual changes which are rung in my ears from morning till night by the English newspapers, can be very pleasant to me. It is hard enough that they are true, harder to hear them from English mouths, and what must it be, after the cry has a little subsided here, to receive a budget of letters blazoning forth the same disgraces in the most glow-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing colors and telling me for my consolation that my country is fast going to ruin? No accounts of some gallant exploit of a Perry or a Burroughs, a mere general outline of which is given here, leaving the particulars to come as they may. . . .

"I am well aware that my sentiments must appear strange to you all, but if it is any satisfaction to you (and I have no doubt it will be) you must know that I act and speak completely from the heart. I have not disguised in the slighest degree; my conscience bears me out in everything. I find that I am three and twenty years old; that I am neither blind nor deaf, can hear and, I hope, understand; that I have some judgment in many things; that I can trace the causes of that judgment to their sources; and I also have found that I am in England, wide awake, and that it is no dream. Now, having found all this, I begin to exercise my judgment (which at twenty-three years of age ought to have acquired a little strength), and I see and hear things every day, and decide accordingly. And yet my brothers tell me they have all the means of knowing, and I none; they are right, and I am wrong. When I see a thing I must believe it; when I hear a sentiment I must believe I heard it. Past twelve. Good night.

"*March 14th, 7 o'clock.*—Good morning. I am up early this morning to get a little time to write you. I left off up to my ears in politics, or rather defending my opinions. One more observation and I have done. You must all see that party spirit rages to a great height in America, in no country so much; that you are surrounded, as it were, with an atmosphere of misrepresentation. If a victory is gained, the first inquiry is, Is he a Federalist? Is he a Democrat? and, according as that question is decided, is he praised or abused. Is not this the case, and is it right? One paper comes out against another with the epithets of 'British hireling,' 'British partisan,' and asserts point-blank that he can prove it. What does the other; pass it over in silence? No, asserts that the other is a 'French hireling,' 'French partisan,' and he can prove it? Do either of them prove it? No; it is written in the morning and forgotten before evening.

"There is, I am ashamed to say, too much of this child's quarreling in America. In a time like the present, when we are engaged in war with a foreign power, to be dividing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and quarreling among ourselves, giving our enemy cause to triumph, to talk of a division of the Union (the darling theme of the English here), when now is the time that we should be most united, when we ought to rouse and by vigorous measures to stop the war (which alone will do it), to be weakening by opposition the measures that are adopted is a course of proceeding which reflects disgrace on my countrymen.

"You will ask me, 'Pray, if we think the war in which we are engaged an unjust one, should we not do all in our power to oppose it?' If every man is at liberty to oppose every measure of government because it does not coincide with his sentiments, what order is to be expected in any country? I think it inseparable from our form of government, however, for if one party is in power the other makes it a point to oppose every measure of its antagonist. If the Federalists were in power, and should declare war against France, what an outcry would be raised against them by the Democrats!

"But where am I going? I do verily think I am going neck and heels into politics again, but I should not have said this much had it not been forced from me by my brothers' letters. *The political part of this letter is addressed to them exclusively.* They are engaged in politics and they ought to read it. Were I a rich man, and they had the disposition, they should spend two or three months in England.

"But I will heave the political anchor and let go all. Mum!"

This letter gives a very clear insight into the character of the man who afterward achieved so much for the good of mankind, for the glory of his country, and for his own renown. He was ever actuated by the loftiest motives; he abhorred pettiness and deceit; his opinions were formed after a careful consideration of the arguments on both sides, but when once convinced of the righteousness of the cause he espoused he expressed himself in no uncertain terms, forcefully yet courteously. In this instance he honestly disagreed with his family at home, but it had no effect whatever on his affection for them or on theirs for him, for they remained a remarkably united family until one by one his parents and his brothers were called away by death and he was left the last survivor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He tried hard to refrain from saying anything more about politics in his letters home at that time, and they are filled with most interesting matter of a different character, but every now and then he half unconsciously strays into the forbidden country. Later on in the letter last quoted from he again returns to the subject:

"I wish you to remember particularly that, although, through want of time to rewrite this, I have confounded the political part of this letter with the rest, I intend the politics for my brothers, and they shall be the last opinions I will write to any of you; for upon rereading them I see the inutility of telling you them, for it is impossible that you should see what I do, therefore you cannot weigh matters properly. I may be wrong, or you may be wrong; but, as different circumstances operate to form different opinions in each of us, we had better not waste our time and destroy our mutual pleasure in receiving letters by discussing so endless a topic as politics, and I agree to drop them altogether."

He held to this resolution quite well for several months, but in a letter of September 9, 1814, he writes:

"As to my health, I never was better; my only anxiety is the welfare of my country, and I assure you I think much of her. I cannot but feel for her when I see such unity in a whole nation for the purpose of *subjugation* and *revenge*, such expectations of a division of our Union, and, on the other side, such encouragement given to these expectations. Posterity will curse the man who first proposes such a measure. I will give no opinion; I see much wrong, and I must feel. My country disgraced or honored is too important an alternative for me to be indifferent to it."

Again on September 23d, after referring to the exploits of the *Wasp* and other American vessels and to certain engagements on land, he says:

"We have also heard of the capture of the *Essex*. Was not that a gallant thing? Porter, I suppose, is to have a ship of the line. He ought to have one; he is a brave fellow. Where is Cousin Breese. Don't he burn to engage a British ship? I should in his situation. I hope he will, and do honor to his country and family.

"There was a report last night that Baltimore was in possession of the British. I don't know what credit is to be attached to it. I hope party spirit will not, as it has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

done, continue to destroy patriotism. He must be a traitor who can feel pleasure in the destruction of any town because it will serve to increase the odium of the party in power. I will think more charitably of my countrymen, and hope, when their shores are invaded, that opposition to government will be swallowed up in a determination to drive from their shores the invaders of their soil."

On October 11, 1814, he makes this last appeal to his father and family:

"I improve an excellent opportunity of writing you by Dr. Romeyn. . . . I shall be ruined in my feelings if I stay longer in England. I cannot endure the continued and daily insults to my feelings as an American. But on this head I promised not to write anything more; still allow me to say but a few words. On second thoughts, however, I will refer you entirely to Dr. Romeyn. If it is possible, as you value my comfort, see him as speedily as possible. He will give you my sentiments exactly, and I fully trust that, after you have heard him converse for a short time, you will completely liberate me from the imputation of error. One sentiment pervades the Americans here; and if one sentiment but pervaded you all at home, Americans would not be the constant theme of insult and abuse.

"I send you some newspapers which have come in my way by accident. I have not picked out the most abusive; they speak the language of all. If ever a nation was completely newspaper led, it is England. They all depend implicitly on what the newspaper says; and when the fountain is corrupt, what can you expect from those who drink of it? But for further particulars *see Dr. Romeyn.* . . .

"For a moment place yourself in my situation, and you will forgive the ardency of my feelings. While I am writing bells are ringing for victory and hand-bills crying about announcing the capture of Cartels, Machias, Buckston, etc., etc. Where is American patriotism! How long shall England, already too proud, glory in the blood of my countrymen! Oh, for the genius of Washington! Had I but his talents, with what alacrity would I return to the relief of that country which (without affectation, my dear parents) is dearer to me than my life. Willingly (I speak with truth and deliberation)—willingly would I sacrifice my life for her honor. Do not think ill of me for speaking thus strongly; you cannot judge impartially of my feelings until you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are placed in my situation. Do not say I suffer myself to be carried away by my feelings; your feelings could never have been tried as mine have; you cannot see with the eyes I do; you cannot have the means of ascertaining *facts* on this side of the water that I have.

"But I will leave this subject and only say *see Dr. Romeyn.*"

It is gratifying to learn that the elder Morse in America, after reading this impassioned appeal from his son and after hearing the reports of Americans who had returned from England, began to see the light, although still enjoining caution on the young man. The following extract is from a letter of the father to the son dated January 25, 1815:

"We have had letters from Dr. Romeyn and Mr. Van Schaick concerning you which have comforted us much. Since receiving them we don't know but we have expressed ourselves in our letters in answer to your last a little stronger than we ought in regard to your political feelings and conduct. I find others who have returned feel pretty much as you do. But it should be remembered that your situation as an artist is different from theirs. It is your wisdom to leave politics to politicians and be solely the artist."

There remains but little more to report. Young Morse proved himself again a true prophet, for in a letter of December 22, 1814, he says:

"With respect to peace, I can only say I should not be surprised if the preliminaries were signed before January."

The treaty of Ghent was signed on December 24, 1814, but not announced until February, 1815. The war was now at an end, and Morse returned to America a few months afterward; but in a letter of March 21, 1815, after describing Napoleon Bonaparte's return from Elba, he has this final word to say:

"The character we have acquired among the nations of Europe in our late contest with England has placed us on such high ground that none of them, England least of all, will wish to embroil themselves with us."

EDWARD L. MORSE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MILITIA NOT A NATIONAL FORCE

BY MAJOR-GENERAL WILLIAM HARDING CARTER, U.S.A.

"The constitutional provision here considered not only affords no warrant for the use of the militia by the general Government, except to suppress insurrection, repel invasion, or to execute the laws of the Union, but, by its careful enumeration of the three occasions or purposes for which the militia may be used, it forbids such use for any other purpose." —[DECISION ATTORNEY-GENERAL.]

NOTWITHSTANDING a clearly expressed and firm determination on the part of the Government not to interfere in the affairs of Mexico, beyond preserving neutrality and protecting the lives of our citizens while engaged in their accustomed vocations within our own borders, the public press has constantly discussed the probability of intervention. The bare possibility of such intervention was justification for inquiry into our own available military resources, for there was constant warning from Mexico that the first step toward occupation would be a signal for an anti-American demonstration and possible general massacre of our citizens residing in that country. Out of this inquiry we have tumbled down a veritable house of cards and received a bloodless lesson which should arouse the interest of the nation and induce immediate action.

Since the Civil War closed some of the States have maintained military organizations quite equal in extent to the entire regular army as it existed prior to 1861. As regiments, brigades, and divisions assumed definite form and considerable strength there arose a disinclination to be called "militia" and many of the State organizations became known as National Guard. Following immediately upon the war with Spain there was a wide-spread and determined movement to nationalize this force and make it a part of the first line in war. The legislation to reorganize the militia and harmonize it with similar bodies of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regular army was strongly opposed by the then Secretary of War, unless coupled with authority for the organization of a reserve for the regular army, to be called the National Volunteer Reserve, with officers appointed by the President, and which could be ordered on service with the regulars without regard to State or national boundaries. It was urged, in opposition, that this would deprive the Governors of the patronage involved in the appointment of the officers, and that service in the volunteers might prove attractive and militate against the National Guard. The proposition for the volunteer reserve was defeated in the Senate.

The responsibility for proper preparation for war is, in the final analysis, placed by the people on the War Department, yet here was an instance where one of the very few great Secretaries of War, studying recent experiences under the existing system, had proposed, not a large regular army, but a volunteer reserve, and had been turned out of court with his scheme by gentlemen whose individual and collective responsibility ceased when they had cast their votes. Under the British system of government, the Minister would have gone out of office with his fellow-members of the cabinet and a new ministry would have come forward with some plan acceptable to the majority of Parliament. Under our form of government, a Secretary may be discredited by disapproval of his recommendations and continue indefinitely in office, with the very certain knowledge that Congress rarely evolves constructive legislation without the initiative of the Secretary whose department is involved, but usually confines its activities to considering estimates. This is a distribution of public responsibility that must be accepted in good faith along with the innumerable benefits of our republican form of government.

As a result of the agitation, however, Congress appropriates about $4,000,000 annually for the support of the National Guard, but the division of this fund is not based upon any sound principle. There is no requirement that each State shall maintain its proportionate share of men, but only that no money shall be paid to those States which do not have militia organized, armed, and equipped in harmony with similar organizations of the regular army.

The army has given its loyal support to the development of this second line, because it has been the only reserve in sight to re-enforce the widely dispersed regulars. The ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

penditure of time, and often of private fortune, on the part of officers and men of the State organizations in preparing for the duties of war, under a general lack of local appreciation and encouragement, has been astonishing. The result of nearly ten years of effort under the new legislation has been a vast improvement and a better state of readiness of the State forces for field service. Much honor and credit is due to those who have so loyally striven to develop and perfect the organized militia of the several States, and it is a serious blow to them to learn, through the recent decision of the Attorney-General, that the President is without authority to call them into active service except to suppress insurrection, repel invasion, or to execute the laws of the Union, as enumerated in the Constitution, notwithstanding the recent act of Congress requiring the militia during the period for which the President calls it forth to serve either within or without the territory of the United States.

The decision is of far-reaching consequences, but is not a surprise to military students, most of whom anticipated a breakdown of the system whenever the militia should be called forth for an unpopular war. It remained for an unhappy revolution in a neighboring republic to bring home the fallacy of our schemes, and we should congratulate ourselves that the lesson has been learned while not yet in sight of the battle-field. Individuals may find it difficult to surrender their several opinions, but wisdom dictates a careful and prompt study of the situation and the application of nation-wide corrective measures. To avoid the waste inseparable from going to war without previous preparation there must be devised a complete system of passing from a peace basis to a war establishment. The Constitution places upon Congress the power and duty of declaring war and providing armies to carry it to a conclusion. In the past it has been our almost invariable custom first to declare war and then to begin to get ready for it.

The two serious military problems of the last century were the Mexican and Civil wars, in both of which experience dictated the use of the volunteer system for serious campaigning, as opposed to calling out the militia. Upon the declaration of war with Spain legislation was enacted authorizing the President to accept, under the call for volunteers, certain organizations of militia and many regiments were obtained in that way. There should be no necessity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for Congressional action of this sort after war is declared. Where the sentiment of a people forbids the maintenance of a proper military establishment for war purposes carefully devised laws for putting the nation under arms should be placed upon the statute-books before an emergency arises. These statutes should be founded upon right principles and have as their basis a practicable scheme for mobilizing armies even before war is declared. It is essential that the force necessary for initiating war should possess a national character. The militia cannot be invested with this national character until after it has been called into service, under the provisions of the Constitution, for while Congress is authorized to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, it may provide for governing only " such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

The most careful students of the history of the great Civil War are unanimous in the opinion that the system adopted by the Southern Confederacy was infinitely more businesslike, and fairer to the community as a whole, than the volunteer system of the North. In the South the services of every able-bodied man were deemed due to the Government. When the flower of the courageous Northern youth had been swallowed up by the armies in the field, the calls for volunteers fell upon ears not so easily attuned to the din of war. Then began a pernicious system of bounties, National and State. New York alone expended upward of $75,000,000 on this account in the effort to fill its quota of troops. When large bounties failed the draft or conscription which produced practically no re-enforcement to the hard-pressed men at the front was applied. The orderly procession of events of a nation at war, and as prescribed under the authority of the Constitution, had been wholly reversed. No system of raising armies produces a better or more intelligent class of soldiers for a great and patriotic war than the American volunteers. No system, however, could be more unjust from an academic view-point. A just and equitable distribution of the duties of citizenship in a republic dictate the righteousness of arranging for the defense of the nation upon a plan which recognizes that each

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and every citizen owes the debt of personal service in war. With a population nearing the hundred-million mark, it will never be necessary to demand actual military service from each and every citizen, but it should not be left to the individual to say whether or not he shall render service in war. There will always be many who, under any rule of right reason, should not enter active service. Campaigning demands the best type of physical manhood, and that the mind shall not be harassed by brooding over dependents left without provision for support and liable to become a public charge. Then there are important civil duties which must go on in war and which require the attention of men. All these details require consideration and action at the hands of the nation and may not be properly left to personal decision. After two years of experience in the great Civil War Congress fully realized that, in some contingencies, nothing short of a nation in arms would suffice, and legislation was enacted for "enrolling, calling out, and organizing the national forces" under the direction of provost-marshals appointed by the President.

The problem of the hour is writ in language not to be misunderstood. Appropriations by the general Government for the militia have doubled under the recent legislation, and their improved condition seemed to justify a united effort to secure further recognition through Congressional appropriations of nearly $10,000,000 annually to pay the officers and men, notwithstanding they are not under the orders of the President. So clearly is this understood that militia organizations are invited, never ordered, to attend joint manœuvers with the army. In depending upon such a system, in an age when ruptures of diplomatic relations come so suddenly as to preclude the possibility of remedying grave shortcomings, we are exhibiting a species of mental apathy not usually credited to Americans.

It is certain that we must increase the available national forces or decrease the necessity for widely dispersed garrisons. Our obligations in the Philippines, Hawaii, Panama, Porto Rico, and Alaska, so far as maintenance of garrisons is concerned, may be regarded as of indefinite duration. The trouble in China may be regarded as an occasional incident. The demands for troops along the Mexican border are not likely to diminish. After providing for these fixed obligations in the way of garrisons, the number of regiments of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mobile army remaining available is not sufficient for an expeditionary force in any probable campaign. It is now positively determined that the organized militia is not subject to call in such a contingency, and therefore some method must be adopted to provide a reserve which may be mobilized even though war be not formally declared. The necessities of the situation demand a greater force than can possibly be provided by extending the enlistment for regulars to embrace a period of reserve obligation. There seems only one course open and that involves the organization and maintenance during peace of a considerable body of United States volunteers separate and distinct from the State militia and with officers appointed by the President as now provided by law. An ideal arrangement would embrace in this volunteer force the young and enthusiastic element of citizen soldiers, who later should pass into the militia along with those whose family ties and obligations might prevent them from seeking service other than in the State organizations.

That the obligations of citizenship may be fully recognized, the volunteer force should be recruited in every Congressional district, the number allotted to each being as nearly in proportion to the whole force as may be practicable, having due regard to units of organization. In this way no one locality may ever claim pre-eminence in performance of its military obligations. Such troops would be subject solely to the call of the President, and may very properly be paid for attendance at drills and camps of instruction. This volunteer force would not be subject to the antagonism sometimes displayed toward the National Guard and militia by labor organizations. On the contrary, labor unions would probably encourage their members in joining this war force if for no other purpose than showing that antagonism to the militia does not arise through lack of patriotism. The volunteer force would afford a field of usefulness to many now allied with the National Guard, but would in no wise be an obstacle to maintenance of the latter.

We are at peace with all the world and we have no resentment stored up against any other nation. It is wholly a family affair if we proceed to amend our military laws and set our house in order. The law under which we have been upbuilding our organizations of citizen soldiery into a national force has been declared unconstitutional and we must amend our methods. WILLIAM HARDING CARTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

SOCIALISM AND THE GREAT STATE. Essays in Construction by H. G. WELLS, FRANCES EVELYN WARWICK, L. G. CHIOZZA MONEY, E. RAY LANKESTER, C. J. BOND, E. S. P. HAYNES, CECIL CHESTERTON, CICELY HAMILTON, ROGER FRY, G. R. S. TAYLOR, CONRAD NOEL, HERBERT TRENCH, HUGH P. VOWLES. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1912.

UTOPIAS have abounded in the minds of generous men since ever words were put upon paper. Since in the early sixteenth century "a fruitfull, pleasaunte, and wittie work, of the best state of a publique weale," was given to the world by a Lord Chancellor who was afterward executed for high treason, we have had continuous attempts at describing a communistic society; a social régime that should aim at the highest welfare for all mankind. Such thinkers and writers have always had against them the great mass of men who stand firmly on the basis that what has been shall be; that no change, into which we are not forced by immediate necessity, can be a good change. Such evils as exploitation of the poor and the weak and the vicious by the rich and the strong and the canny have always been; therefore to attempt change is to lay an impious hand upon established custom. Our finest American contribution to a transvaluation of set ideals was Mr. Howells's *Through the Eye of a Needle,* published some six or eight years ago. The ranks of those who feel that no change is necessary until we are forced into it are constantly diminishing, and new schemes for a Utopia are appearing on every side.

The present volume, made up of thirteen chapters by thirteen different writers, might have gained if the whole material had been sifted by H. G. Wells and then reappeared molded by him. His first chapter, on the relation of the Great State to the Past, is the ablest in the book. It is clear, constructive, reasonable. He points out that what has been considered the normal social life, the antique type of human association and employment, has never been a whole and complete life for humanity. There have always been forces and influences without that have pointed to supplemental, often antagonistic modes of living. This is the result of the fact that human beings have never yet achieved perfect adaptation to the needs of the Normal Social Life. Even the insects, ants, and bees have attained more frictionless association. Practically the whole of history is the record of the outsiders, the dissatisfied, the abnormal who make a series of attacks, supplemental, modifying, changeful, upon the mute and static normal life. This minority makes a cult of receptivity; a cult not only accepting but hunting out new ideas whereby the suf-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fering of humanity may be lessened. Mere conservative feeling, however stubborn and logical, will not save the world. And among conservative thinkers Mr. Wells oddly places Roosevelt "in his Western-farmer, philoprogenitive phase as distinguished from his more imperialist moments"; William Morris, with his hatred of all modern invasions that offend the esthetic sense.

The hope of the world, in Mr. Wells's view, lies with those who do not fear change or experiment; who do not consider contemporary humanity the final outcome of life. They look with adventurous hopefulness toward new ways of living, new methods of human association.

Among such, but opposed to the individualist who distrusts all collective procedure, Mr. Wells and the dozen friends who have helped build this book of a future outlook look toward a collective effort and collective design organized to control and check dangerous accumulations of wealth; ill-defined, irresponsible, and socially dangerous power; and, on the other hand, to check the labor hordes who have neither property, leisure, outlook, nor hope. As against planless progressives Mr. Wells names his party the Constructors, and that which they are to build is the Great State, a state capable of so legislating as to bring about a more spacious social order than any that has yet existed; a world of peace and plenty, increased health and happiness, and containing seeds of a still greater future. At the base of such legislation there must be carefully adjusted agricultural production; easy and swift transit, so that the agricultural laborer may share in all the advantages of an urban life; while machinery is to lift from man the worst of his labors. The Great State is no longer to have a class set apart to do commonplace work for mediocre wages while another class rides by on the roads with a secret sense of superiority. Superiority is debasing to the character of the one who indulges in it and wounding to its object, therefore an unwholesome element to be destroyed in the Great State. There is therefore to be invented for the Great State an economic method which does away with a specific labor class. With the help of scientific economy and power-producing machinery the work of the world is to be reduced to so small a number of working-hours per head as to be met by the gratuitous share of each individual in the general output. As regards the disagreeable, rough, monotonous operations, these will be met by a form of conscription in which each individual will devote, say, one year of his life to the public service.

Of the thirteen essays in the volume, that of Wells is most logical and valuable. Lady Warwick's plea for the breaking up of huge cities into small towns, with available country spaces near at hand, does not seem to make sufficient allowances for the purely gregarious creature, who draws inspiration from massed humanity. The essay on "Woman in the State," by Cicely Hamilton, is somewhat robbed of persuasiveness by a touch of temper. Woman has indeed suffered at the hands of all states heretofore, but her only weapon now is in dignified and constructive progression. No resentment of the past can afford to mingle with the liberalizing movement of to-day. The entire question now at issue, thinks Cicely Hamilton, is whether women, like the other half of the race, have a primary, individual, and responsible existence. If so, it stands to reason that she must have the same freedom, the same political rights that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a man has. Her best argument is that such freedom, such dignity will redound to the benefit of the race. The children of a free woman must necessarily be nobler than the children of a slave. The author of this essay views with great hopefulness the touch of rowdyism which the militant suffrage movement has called forth in the young Englishwoman of to-day. It is quite possible to diverge from this point of view and to hope that the present movement toward equalization of the sexes may result in a wider distribution of virtues rather than the adoption by the gentler sex of the manly failings.

"Work in the Great State," by Chiozza Money, M.P., is a very able exposition of the way in which science might deal with production to lessen the burden of work. According to this writer, all art-work shall be done by amateurs in unprofessional hours—"an amateur life of individual work and recreation embroidered upon the main social fabric formed by exertion in professional work."

Perhaps the least able paper is that on the "Church of the Great State," by the Rev. Conrad Noel. It is marred by sentimentalism. However, two movements now slowly gaining ground, The Religious Forward Movement and the Movement toward Church Unity, both go to show that the Church is unwilling to be kept behind in the struggle for better conditions, and that the sense of being a brother's keeper is penetrating even such strongholds of conservatism.

The great value of the book is that it is based on hope and faith. It refuses to believe, as the conservative thinkers of the day do, that because certain evils have existed a long time they must continue to be destructive factors forever. The world, after all, is plastic, and we do not have to obey any law of changeless evil.

THE LIFE OF JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN. By WILFRED WARD. In two volumes. New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1912.

Even so late as 1885 a vast amount of ignorance and misunderstanding prevailed concerning the great writer and picturesque personality whose life is given ably and fully in Wilfred Ward's two large volumes. Although William Barry's Life in the *Literary Lives Series* appeared in 1904, now for the first time a full and adequate record is available. Newman is not only a figure in literature; he is a figure in history, representing as he does the beginning of the great renascence of faith and the escape from eighteenth-century rationalism.

He is the forerunner of the modern religious consciousness. As a writer he reached a point of persuasive eloquence which has not been surpassed, and will with difficulty be attained again. Though, as a rule, definite and precise in imagery, he was yet capable of so mystic a doctrine as that the image of Christ is imprinted in the minds of each of his subjects individually, and that that image, once known and worshiped, becomes a bond among those subjects, making them members of the one body of Christ.

Newman had the reserves of a shy man, and even those who knew him in Edgbaston, in that sunniest decade of his life from 1880 till 1890, had no idea of the fund of tenderness, playfulness, and friendliness which the letters in these volumes reveal. It is inexpressibly touching, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

example, to see the list of those for whom he was accustomed to pray: for those "Dear to me; kind to me; faithful women; with claims on me; loyal to me; ecclesiastic; all who attend our church; all who are in our schools; all in Birmingham; all in England; the Queen, etc."

It has been said of Newman's English style that it had "learned to smile." It is also true that in accepting the faith of Rome he gained with it a great fund of childlike naïveté of expression. His letters to the nuns at Stone, to Mother Ismelda Poole and Mother Margaret Hallahan of the Dominicans, are full of this quality of simplicity, playfulness, profound dependence on divine aid. The chapter dealing with the writing of the *Apologia* shows Newman in quite a new light to those who are accustomed only to his brilliant and satiric side, his austerity, his high invective and keen irony. "I have never been in such stress of brain and such pain of heart," he writes to Hope-Scott; and again he speaks of it as "one of the most painful trials of my life." He reports sometimes sobbing so bitterly as he wrote that he could not proceed with the writing. This sensitiveness, this power of being hurt and suffering under attack, contrasts very strikingly with Kingsley's coarse indifference and brutality.

No one is more fitted to gather and edit the records of this beautiful and interesting figure than Wilfred Ward. Himself a devout Catholic, educated at the Gregorian University, Rome, son of W. S. Ward (the "Ideal" Ward of the Oxford Movement), who was Newman's life-long friend, and finally having gone over all the ground before in his *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman,* he was the chosen one in all England to set before the world at last, in his habit as he lived, the much-persecuted Cardinal. Cardinal Newman, hated and distrusted by the Anglicans, for a long period only partially accepted by Rome, did more than any other single figure to make Roman Catholicism understood and respected among English-speaking people. His power of distinguishing between truths accepted by the reason and truths accepted by the heart has kept many at ease in the churches who would otherwise have been wholly adrift in a sea of agnosticism to-day.

This biography is sympathetic and explanatory without being partisan. Mr. Ward is less severe on Kingsley's inexcusable conduct throughout the controversy that brought forth the *Apologia* than was William Barry. In as far as is possible the great Cardinal is allowed to speak for himself in his letters and in analyses of his writings. Careful and full data of the conditions and the stimulus under which his books were produced are given. Surely few lives in the Victorian era had in them greater stress and strain, involved more closely the destinies and careers of other great men and profound thinkers, and were of more significant importance to the development of religious thought than Newman's. Considered from a literary, historic, or religious point of view, it is a most valuable and important book.

THE GREAT ANALYSIS. A Plea for a Rational World-Order, with a Preface. By GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

"I do not believe that any one who has not gone specially into the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subject can realize how enormously our armory of social knowledge has increased in the last two or three generations," says Gilbert Murray in his Preface to this anonymous essay. He goes on to tell us that this little monograph brought relief to his aching mind and a new hope of a higher and better civilization. "If Aristotle were alive," he says, "I should have no more doubts." He feels that Aristotle would take the amassed knowledge of the last few generations and lead us to the great Synthesis.

The essayist says that what hinders us to-day from reducing our chaos to order is the vastness of the world. The purpose of the essay is to inquire whether the human mind must forever remain inadequate to its task. The suggestion is made that an instrument of real precision lies ready to hand. This instrument is Statistics—the quantitative study of social and economic phenomena. Geographic information is increasing daily; the jungle is thrown open to inspection; the world has attained almost complete geographic self-consciousness. It now behooves man, according to this author, to put its affairs into the hands of a group of men (and women?) capable of sustained and accurate thinking to plan a new order with a view to the common weal. This order should be always plastic, open to readjustments and after-thought; the principle of scientific management would be recognized in all departments of life.

The truth is, this essay is one more effort to make the world and humanity conscious of itself as a whole. Statesmen have urged upon us to "think imperially"; this is a call to think "planetarily." It is really only a new application of the Christian doctrine in which every man is a brother. The most hopeful thing the author says is that "what leading intelligences absorb to-day as an idea, to-morrow tingles as an instinct through the nerves of the whole race." The great Analysis of our present needs and conditions will radiate from brain to brain and reach all who are subject to suggestion.

By a free application of intelligence to the problems of human life we may ultimately bring about a complete revaluation of economic and political methods to the ultimate improvement of human conditions. Once more this author brings to us the truth, now so often reiterated, that we may hope realization of it may amount to an instinct in two more generations, that the welfare of one is to be found only in the welfare of all; that no human soul can truly and permanently flourish at the expense of another human soul.

THE NEW DEMOCRACY. By WALTER E. WEYL. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912.

The first half of this book is devoted to a summing up of what a democratic government has done for us thus far in the States. That at the present moment we have not reached an ideal democracy is evident. Beside the stately phrases of the Declaration of Independence we hear men crying out on all sides upon the sensational inequalities of wealth, insane extravagances, strident ostentations, upon our boss-ridden cities, pauperism, vice, crime, insanity, and degeneration; the spread of hunger-born degradation, the spread of social vice due in numerous instances to the force of actual physical want. No one believes, says the author, after this century of progress that the children of America are endowed with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equal opportunities of life, health, education, fructifying leisure. In the place of these we have a resplendent plutocracy. A plutocracy which the author defines as a more or less fluctuating group of very wealthy men, loosely united (primarily by pecuniary bonds), who through their wealth and prestige, and through the allegiance of like-minded but poorer men, exert an enormous, if not preponderating, influence over industry, politics, and public opinion. The author then reviews what he conceives to be the influence of the Plutocracy in Politics, and its practical control of public opinion and the press.

The last half of the book is constructive, and an able presentation of the tasks now ahead of democracy in its dealings with class prejudice, political and industrial programmes, and finally with social problems.

Democracy is an experiment, after all, but so far as we have gone in it it has had so little chance of development that we can hardly tell whether or not it is of ultimate benefit to humanity.

Dr. Weyl's summing up of the present status of democracy is clear and unprejudiced, and will do much toward clarifying and ordering our knowledge of the stage which democracy has reached at the present moment.

DEMOCRATIC ENGLAND. By PERCY ALDEN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912.

That England is a much more democratic country than our own is a hackneyed statement nowadays. Percy Alden's *Democratic England* is an excellent companion to Dr. Weyl's *New Democracy*.

The problem to which the democracy of England is addressing itself now with great force is that of raising the general standard of comfort. To point out by what means this may be accomplished Mr. Alden constantly turns to the methods of Australia and New Zealand, the most successful democracies thus far. That we are on the way to improvement may be derived from the statement that at the time of the accession of Queen Victoria there was not a single act of Parliament to represent the interest of the State in the welfare of the young. Brutal cruelty and distressing ignorance were displayed in the treatment of children. The efforts of philanthropists like Shaftesbury, Oastler, Sadler, and Robert Owen have instituted great changes in this matter. The entire chapter on the relation of the State to the child shows how conscientiously Great Britain is going to work to take care of her young. The Notification of Births Act, the extension of the school age, the child-labor laws, the new hygienic measures introduced into the schools, the free feeding in some schools (Provision of Meals Act), medical inspection in the schools, the municipal swimming-baths, all go to show the great improvement that has come about within fifty years. The whole policy of the present government is to cut down child labor, to raise the school age, and to insist on technical and manual training which will allow of entry to skilled industry later on.

The book also goes on to show in detail the sympathy and interest of the public and the government in the sweated workers, the unemployed, the sick, and the aged destitute. There is an exceedingly able chapter on housing the poor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The worst abuse in England to-day is land monopoly, and even with the many improvements and changes that have been carried out the fact remains that the bulk of the United Kingdom is owned by a comparatively small number of people. The figures as given are: twenty-eight dukes hold estates to the amount of 4,000,000 acres; thirty-three marquises hold 1,500,000 acres; 194 earls have 5,862,000 acres; and 270 viscounts and barons, 3,785,000 acres.

In the year 1700 nine-tenths of Scotland and two-thirds of Ireland were owned by 1,942 persons. Even now a majority of the people of Great Britain possess no right whatever to their native soil. The present President of the Board of Agriculture is making some effort toward the diffusion of the land by means of the Small Holdings Act and the Development Act. In such legislation the experiment has first been tried successfully in the colonies, as witness the breaking up in New Zealand of the Great Cheviot Estate of 84,000 acres, subdivided into agricultural farms of from 500 to 3,000 acres each. The Australian colonies have pursued a like course in the division of great estates with excellent results.

One's chief feeling in laying aside such a book as *Democratic England* is one of awe at the vast superiority of English statesmanship over American politics, and the resultant good to the country at large.

THE DRAMA OF LOVE AND DEATH. By EDWARD CARPENTER. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1912.

There is not a little difficulty in dealing briefly with as spacious speculation as Mr. Carpenter undertakes here. Beginning his literary career with studies of civilization, and especially with investigations into democratic emotions as revealed in Walt Whitman, Carpenter has little by little shed the husks of outer perceptions and addressed his thought more and more toward the life of the soul. Yet it is easy to see how his past work has slowly led up to this present book. *Toward Democracy, England's Ideal, Civilization—its Cause and Cure, Love's Coming of Age* were all more or less studies in human feeling. From then on, in *Adam's Peak to Elephanta, Who Shall Command the Heart?* above all, *The Art of Creation,* are studies in superhuman development. *The Drama of Love and Death* comes as the crown of all the previous work. Although written with simplicity and directness, and here and there with touches of humor, it is no easy volume for the uninitiate to assimilate. It represents many years of profound meditation as well as deep experience in occult matters. Chapters XI. and XII. are not easy reading for any one unskilled in mystic contemplation. It might even be desired that Chapter XI., on the materialization of forms, should have been omitted, since it makes so little appeal to the average consciousness.

There is a profound, wide-reaching, and hopeful religion in this book. Love and death, strangely linked and strangely related, move to the very loftiest reaches of life. "Changing their form but not their essence, they accompany us to the last; and we forebode them, in the final account, as no longer the tyrannous and often terrible overlords of our mortal days, but rather our most indispensable companions without whom life in its higher ranges could not well be maintained." The chapters pass

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through such sequence as the beginnings of love and love as an art. The chapter on "Love's Ultimate Meanings" is not altogether satisfactory, since Mr. Carpenter hardly tells what the ultimate meanings are. Doubtless from the whole book one derives the doctrine that the ultimate meaning of love is purely spiritual, that it relates the separate person first to one or two, and ultimately to the whole. But the end of the specific chapter is merely to state that the passion is a wonderful and mysterious thing about which as little as possible should be said. Silence and time alone avail to prove its meanings. "These things lie on the knees of the gods; which place—though it may seem, as some one has said, rather cold and uncomfortable—is perhaps the best place for them." Mr. Carpenter is not afraid to speculate as to states after death, as well as upon the more practical subject of the art of dying, or the best preparation for so great a change. The body he treats throughout as the root of the soul. The real self is related to the All-self, and therefore perfectly safe and indestructible. It is this undercurrent of perfect security in the life surpassing that of the body which is the basic fact of Carpenter's philosophy, and he uses love with its carelessness of physical life as his main proof that death is a mere incident in an eternal career. Nowhere that we know has reincarnation received a more logical and sensible exposition than in this volume. It is a book too deeply philosophic to be given over entirely to faddists, too human to belong only to technical philosophers, too important to be passed over by the casual reader, too vitally connected with daily living and daily consciousness to be missed by any one capable of reflection. ———

DEATH. By MAURICE MAETERLINCK. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1912.

Very different from Mr. Carpenter's speculations, more timid, more attuned to the average consciousness of the man of the world, are Maurice Maeterlinck's reflections upon death. Poetic in form and of low flight, his speculations are likely to repeat in happier terms the thoughts of all men. The limited ego, eternally stretched out over time, would be torture; but we have a right to think we shall in some way be perpetuated in some wider, more fertile environment. It is possible, he believes, that our best thoughts shall welcome us on the other bank, and that the quality of our intellect here shall determine that of the infinite that crystallizes about us there. This is not so hopeful an idea as the everlasting growth of consciousness which Carpenter offers us.

"It is probable," says Maeterlinck, "that the universe is seeking and finding itself every day, that it has not become entirely conscious, and does not yet know what it wants." He, however, ends upon the hopeful thought that if the universe ever finishes at all, it must reach complete exemption from suffering.

This little volume containing these speculations upon the nature and meaning of death is the most notable essay Maeterlinck has published since those contained in the volumes *The Treasure of the Humble* and *Wisdom and Destiny*. ———

THE HILL OF VISION. By JAMES STEPHENS. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912.

In 1909 the Dublin firm of Maunsel & Co. brought out a tiny

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volume of verse by James Stephens called *Insurrections*. The verses were dedicated to A. E., and that in itself was a commendation to those who search out and love that retiring poet. The volume was full of promise, being so evidently by a young man, thoroughly surprised at his own generous defiance of life and the Old World's ways.

"What's the use
Of my abuse?
The world will run
Around the sun
As it has done
Since time begun
When I have drifted to the deuce."

So much he correctly surmises in his Foreword, but not without the poetic thrill of self-gratulation that he should have discovered and ejaculated the fact so cleverly. However, a good dozen of the poems in that first little book promised real results when the young man should cease to look at himself and begin to look at life.

The Hill of Vision is a beautiful title, and the tiny prologue is interesting:

"Everything that I can spy
Through the circle of my eye,
Everything that I can see,
Has been woven out of me."

So excellently he begins, and yet the volume is disappointing. The Prelude is interminable and full of insignificant repetition. Occasionally one is reminded of Blake, but Blake always rewards one for meditation upon a seemingly simple statement by the profound significance hidden. Somehow one fails to find any particular profundity under such lines as:

"Damn yesterday! and this and that,
And these and those, and all the flat
Dull catalogue of weighty things
That somehow fastened to my wings."

The ejaculatory form is worn threadbare in this volume, and too many words convey too little meaning. *The Hill of Vision* cannot bear comparison with the earlier book, but even this statement is far from denying that the poet may not recapture his earlier inspiration, and, in time, learn more of craftsmanship.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED